DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 405 567 CS 012 755

AUTHOR Koskinen, Patricia S.; And Others
TITLE Book Access and Rereading with Audiotapes: Extending Literacy Learning into the Homes of Culturally and Linguistically Diverse Students. Reading Research Report No. 75.
INSTITUTION National Reading Research Center, Athens, GA.; National Reading Research Center, College Park, MD.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Educational Research and Improvement (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE 97
CONTRACT 117A20007
NOTE 53p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Elementary Education; *English Instruction; Parent Participation; Program Effectiveness; *Reading Achievement; *Reading Motivation; Reading Research; *Second Language Learning; *Talking Books
IDENTIFIERS *Diversity (Student); Nonnative Speakers

ABSTRACT

With the rapidly increasing number of second-language learners in elementary school classrooms and the difficulty they are experiencing in learning to read, educators need to create literacy programs that are appropriate for children who speak English as a second language (ESL) as well as native English-speaking (NES) students. There is also a need to support literacy instruction in other contexts, especially in the home. A study investigated whether rereading at home is a significant supplement to the literacy instructional program of ESL and NES students. Of specific interest was exploring the impact of increased access to books and rereading with an audio model in children's reading achievement and motivation. For a 7-month period, 131 first graders in 12 classrooms participated in 1 of 3 treatment groups: (1) structured shared reading at school in a book-rich environment and daily rereading of books with audiotapes at home; (2) structured shared reading at school in a book-rich environment; or (3) unmodified school reading. Results revealed enhanced comprehension and motivation for book-rich classrooms both with and without a home component. In addition, whereas home-based reading with audio support increased many students' reading interest and promoted parental involvement in literacy activities, it appeared to have particular benefits for second-language learners. (Contains 63 references and 8 tables of data. An appendix lists books used in the school-home reading projects.) (Author/RS)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 405 567

Book Access and Rereading with Audiotapes: Extending Literacy Learning into the Homes of Culturally and Linguistically Diverse Students

Patricia S. Koskinen
University of Maryland College Park

Irene H. Blum
Stephanie A. Bisson
Stephanie M. Phillips
Terry S. Creamer
Fairfax County Public Schools

Tara Kelley Baker
University of Maryland College Park

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

AS 012755

NRRC National Reading Research Center

READING RESEARCH REPORT NO. 75
Winter 1997

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

NRRC

National Reading Research Center

Book Access and Rereading with Audiotapes: Extending Literacy Learning into the Homes of Culturally and Liguistically Diverse Students

Patricia S. Koskinen
University of Maryland College Park

Irene H. Blum
Stephanie A. Bisson
Stephanie M. Phillips
Terry S. Creamer
Fairfax County Public Schools

Tara Kelley Baker
University of Maryland College Park

READING RESEARCH REPORT NO. 75
Winter 1997

The work reported herein is a National Reading Research Center Project of the University of Georgia and University of Maryland. It was supported under the Educational Research and Development Centers Program (PR/AWARD NO. 117A20007) as administered by the Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education. The findings and opinions expressed here do not necessarily reflect the position or policies of the National Reading Research Center, the Office of Educational Research and Improvement, or the U.S. Department of Education.

NRRC National Reading Research Center

Executive Committee
Donna E. Alvermann, Co-Director
University of Georgia
John T. Guthrie, Co-Director
University of Maryland College Park
James F. Baumann, Associate Director
University of Georgia
Patricia S. Koskinen, Associate Director
University of Maryland College Park
Jamie Lynn Metsala, Associate Director
University of Maryland College Park
Penny Oldfather
University of Georgia
John F. O'Flahavan
University of Maryland College Park
James V. Hoffman
University of Texas at Austin
Cynthia R. Hynd
University of Georgia
Robert Serpell
University of Maryland Baltimore County
Betty Shockley-Bisplinghoff
Clarke County School District, Athens, Georgia
Linda DeGroff
University of Georgia

Publications Editors

Research Reports and Perspectives
Linda DeGroff, Editor
University of Georgia
James V. Hoffman, Associate Editor
University of Texas at Austin
Mariam Jean Dreher, Associate Editor
University of Maryland College Park
Instructional Resources
Lee Galda, *University of Georgia*
Research Highlights
William G. Holliday
University of Maryland College Park
Policy Briefs
James V. Hoffman
University of Texas at Austin
Videos
Shawn M. Glynn, *University of Georgia*

NRRC Staff
Barbara F. Howard, Office Manager
Kathy B. Davis, Senior Secretary
University of Georgia

Barbara A. Neitzey, Administrative Assistant
Valerie Tyra, Accountant
University of Maryland College Park

National Advisory Board
Phyllis W. Aldrich
Saratoga Warren Board of Cooperative Educational Services, Saratoga Springs, New York
Arthur N. Applebee
State University of New York, Albany
Ronald S. Brandt
Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development
Marshá T. DeLain
Delaware Department of Public Instruction
Carl A. Grant
University of Wisconsin-Madison
Barbara McCombs
Mid-Continent Regional Educational Laboratory (MCREL)
Luis C. Moll
University of Arizona
Carol M. Santa
School District No. 5
Kalispell, Montana
Anne P. Sweet
Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education
Louise Cherry Wilkinson
Rutgers University
Peter Winograd
University of Kentucky

Production Editor
Katherine P. Hutchison
University of Georgia

Assistant Production Editor
Jennifer Moon
University of Georgia

Dissemination Coordinator
Jordana E. Rich
University of Georgia

Text Formatter
Angela R. Wilson
University of Georgia

NRRC - University of Georgia
318 Aderhold
University of Georgia
Athens, Georgia 30602-7125
(706) 542-3674 Fax: (706) 542-3678
INTERNET: NRRC@uga.cc.uga.edu

NRRC - University of Maryland College Park
3216 J. M. Patterson Building
University of Maryland
College Park, Maryland 20742
(301) 405-8035 Fax: (301) 314-9625
INTERNET: NRRC@umail.umd.edu

About the National Reading Research Center

The National Reading Research Center (NRRC) is funded by the Office of Educational Research and Improvement of the U.S. Department of Education to conduct research on reading and reading instruction. The NRRC is operated by a consortium of the University of Georgia and the University of Maryland College Park in collaboration with researchers at several institutions nationwide.

The NRRC's mission is to discover and document those conditions in homes, schools, and communities that encourage children to become skilled, enthusiastic, lifelong readers. NRRC researchers are committed to advancing the development of instructional programs sensitive to the cognitive, sociocultural, and motivational factors that affect children's success in reading. NRRC researchers from a variety of disciplines conduct studies with teachers and students from widely diverse cultural and socioeconomic backgrounds in pre-kindergarten through grade 12 classrooms. Research projects deal with the influence of family and family-school interactions on the development of literacy; the interaction of sociocultural factors and motivation to read; the impact of literature-based reading programs on reading achievement; the effects of reading strategies instruction on comprehension and critical thinking in literature, science, and history; the influence of innovative group participation structures on motivation and learning; the potential of computer technology to enhance literacy; and the development of methods and standards for alternative literacy assessments.

The NRRC is further committed to the participation of teachers as full partners in its research. A better understanding of how teachers view the development of literacy, how they use knowledge from research, and how they approach change in the classroom is crucial to improving instruction. To further this understanding, the NRRC conducts school-based research in which teachers explore their own philosophical and pedagogical orientations and trace their professional growth.

Dissemination is an important feature of NRRC activities. Information on NRRC research appears in several formats. *Research Reports* communicate the results of original research or synthesize the findings of several lines of inquiry. They are written primarily for researchers studying various areas of reading and reading instruction. The *Perspective Series* presents a wide range of publications, from calls for research and commentary on research and practice to first-person accounts of experiences in schools. *Instructional Resources* include curriculum materials, instructional guides, and materials for professional growth, designed primarily for teachers.

For more information about the NRRC's research projects and other activities, or to have your name added to the mailing list, please contact:

Donna E. Alvermann, Co-Director
National Reading Research Center
318 Aderhold Hall
University of Georgia
Athens, GA 30602-7125
(706) 542-3674

John T. Guthrie, Co-Director
National Reading Research Center
3216 J. M. Patterson Building
University of Maryland
College Park, MD 20742
(301) 405-8035

NRRC Editorial Review Board

Peter Afflerbach
University of Maryland College Park

Jane Agee
University of Georgia

JoBeth Allen
University of Georgia

Janice F. Almasi
University of Buffalo–SUNY

Patty Anders
University of Arizona

Harriette Arrington
University of Kentucky

Marlia Banning
University of Utah

Jill Bartoli
Elizabethtown College

Eurydice Bauer
University of Georgia

Janet Benton
Bowling Green, Kentucky

Irene Blum
Pine Springs Elementary School
Falls Church, Virginia

David Bloome
Vanderbilt University

John Borkowski
Notre Dame University

Fenice Boyd
University of Georgia

Karen Bromley
Binghamton University

Martha Carr
University of Georgia

Suzanne Clewell
Montgomery County Public Schools
Rockville, Maryland

Joan Coley
Western Maryland College

Michelle Commeyras
University of Georgia

Linda Cooper
Shaker Heights City Schools
Shaker Heights, Ohio

Karen Costello
Connecticut Department of Education
Hartford, Connecticut

Jim Cunningham
Gibsonville, North Carolina

Karin Dahl
Ohio State University

Marcia Delany
Wilkes County Public Schools
Washington, Georgia

Lynne Diaz-Rico
California State University-San
Bernardino

Mark Dressman
New Mexico State University

Ann Duffy
University of Georgia

Ann Egan-Robertson
Amherst College

Jim Flood
San Diego State University

Dana Fox
University of Arizona

Linda Gambrell
University of Maryland College Park

Mary Graham
McLean, Virginia

Rachel Grant
University of Maryland College Park

Barbara Guzzetti
Arizona State University

Frances Hancock
Concordia College of Saint Paul,
Minnesota

Kathleen Heubach
Virginia Commonwealth University

Sally Hudson-Ross
University of Georgia

Cynthia Hynd
University of Georgia

Gay Ivey
University of Georgia

David Jardine
University of Calgary

Robert Jimenez
University of Oregon

Michelle Kelly
University of Utah

James King
University of South Florida

Kate Kirby
Georgia State University

Linda Labbo
University of Georgia

Michael Law
University of Georgia

Donald T. Leu
Syracuse University

Susan Lytle
University of Pennsylvania

Bert Mangino
Las Vegas, Nevada

Susan Mazzoni
Baltimore, Maryland

Ann Dacey McCann
University of Maryland College Park

Sarah McCarthey
University of Texas at Austin

Veda McClain
University of Georgia

Lisa McFalls
University of Georgia

Randy McGinnis
University of Maryland

Mike McKenna
Georgia Southern University

Barbara Michalove
Fourth Street Elementary School
Athens, Georgia

Elizabeth B. Moje
University of Utah

Lesley Morrow
Rutgers University

Bruce Murray
Auburn University

Susan Neuman
Temple University

John O'Flahavan
University of Maryland College Park

Marilyn Ohlhausen-McKinney
University of Nevada

Penny Oldfather
University of Georgia

Barbara M. Palmer
Mount Saint Mary's College

Stephen Phelps
Buffalo State College

Mike Pickle
Georgia Southern University

Amber T. Prince
Berry College

Gaoyin Qian
Lehman College–CUNY

Tom Reeves
University of Georgia

Lenore Ringler
New York University

Mary Roe
University of Delaware

Nadeen T. Ruiz
California State University-
Sacramento

Olivia Saracho
University of Maryland College Park

Paula Schwanenflugel
University of Georgia

Robert Serpell
University of Maryland Baltimore
County

Betty Shockley-Bisplinghoff
Barnett Shoals Elementary School
Athens, Georgia

Wayne H. Slater
University of Maryland College Park

Margaret Smith
Las Vegas, Nevada

Susan Sonnenschein
University of Maryland Baltimore
County

Bernard Spodek
University of Illinois

Bettie St. Pierre
University of Georgia

Steve Stahl
University of Georgia

Roger Stewart
Boise State University

Anne P. Sweet
Office of Educational Research
and Improvement

Louise Tomlinson
University of Georgia

Bruce VanSledright
University of Maryland College Park

Barbara Walker
Eastern Montana University–Billings

Louise Waynant
Prince George's County Schools
Upper Marlboro, Maryland

Dera Weaver
Athens Academy
Athens, Georgia

Jane West
Agnes Scott College

Renee Weisburg
Elkins Park, Pennsylvania

Allan Wigfield
University of Maryland College Park

Shelley Wong
University of Maryland College Park

Josephine Peyton Young
University of Georgia

Hallie Yopp
California State University

About the Authors

Patricia S. Koskinen is a principal investigator at the National Reading Research Center. In addition, she is a member of the Reading Center and the Graduate Faculty in the College of Education at the University of Maryland. Dr. Koskinen has been a language arts and classroom teacher and also has taught a range of graduate and undergraduate courses in reading and children's literature. Her research interests include motivation, vocabulary learning, and reading comprehension instruction. She may be contacted at the National Reading Research Center, 3216 J.M. Patterson Building, University of Maryland at College Park, College Park, Maryland 20742.

Irene H. Blum is a reading and ESL consultant in Singapore. She is also a Principal Investigator with the National Reading Research Center. After receiving her Ph.D. from the University of Maryland, she directed a number of grants and served as Field Placement Coordinator in the Department of Education at Catholic University, Washington, DC. She has taught elementary school in New Jersey and California and was a reading specialist/Reading Recovery© teacher with the Fairfax County Public Schools, Fairfax, Virginia. Her research interests include language and reading acquisition and early literacy instruction. She may be contacted at PSC 470 RMO, FPO AP 96534-0001.

Stephanie A. Bisson is the assistant coordinator for Title I in the Fairfax County Public Schools. She earned her B.A. at Hamline University in Minnesota and her M.A. at Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University. Her research interests include early literacy learning, staff development, and family literacy. She may be contacted at the Lacey Instructional Center, Title I Office, 3705 Crest Drive, Annandale, VA 22003.

Stephanie M. Phillips is a Program Assistant in the Title I Office in the Fairfax County Public Schools. She earned her B.S. at Hampton University in Early Childhood Education and her graduate degree at Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University in reading. Her current research interests include early literacy learning. She may be contacted at the Lacey Center, Title I Office, 3705 Crest Drive, Annandale, VA 22003.

Terry S. Creamer is a first-grade teacher in the Fairfax County Public Schools. She earned her B.S. at Radford University in Virginia and her M.A. at the University of Virginia. Her current research interest is in applying Reading Recovery© techniques in the classroom setting. She may be contacted at Halley Elementary School, 8850 Cross Chase Circle, Fairfax Station, VA 22039.

Tara Kelley Baker is a graduate assistant at the National Reading Research Center. She received her B.S.W. at Wheelock College, her M.S.W. at Boston University and is currently working towards her Ph.D. in Human Development at the University of Maryland. Her research interests include motivation and self-regulation. She may be contacted at the National Reading Research Center, 3216 J.M. Patterson Building, University of Maryland at College Park, College Park, Maryland 20742.

National Reading Research Center
Universities of Georgia and Maryland
Reading Research Report No. 75
Winter 1997

Book Access and Rereading with Audiotapes: Extending Literacy Learning into the Homes of Culturally and Linguistically Diverse Students

Patricia S. Koskinen
University of Maryland College Park

Irene H. Blum
Stephanie A. Bisson
Stephanie M. Phillips
Terry S. Creamer
Fairfax County Public Schools

Tara Kelley Baker
University of Maryland College Park

Abstract. *With the rapidly increasing number of second-language learners in elementary school classrooms and the difficulty they are experiencing in learning to read, educators need to create literacy programs that are appropriate for children who speak English as a second-language (ESL) as well as native English-speaking (NES) students. There is also a need to support literacy instruction in other contexts, especially in the home. The purpose of the present study was to investigate whether rereading at home is a significant supplement to the literacy instructional program of ESL and NES students. Of specific interest was exploring the impact of increased access to books and rereading with an audio model on children's reading achievement and motivation. For a seven-month period, 131 first-graders in 12 classrooms participated in one of three treatment groups: (a) structured shared reading at school in a book-rich environment and daily rereading of books with audiotapes at home, (b) structured shared reading at school in a book-rich environment, or (c) unmodified school reading. Results revealed enhanced comprehension and motivation for book-rich classrooms both with and without a home component. In addition, whereas home-based reading with audio support increased many students' reading interest and promoted parental involvement in literacy activities, it appeared to have particular benefits for second-language learners.*

Schools in the United States are facing the ever-increasing challenge of educating students who do not speak English as their first language. Between 1970 and 1994, the proportion of the United States' population that was foreign-born increased from 4.8 to 8.7% (Hansen

& Bachu, 1995). Current projections estimate the number of United States residents who speak English as a second language will reach 40 million by the year 2000 (Trueba, 1989). Recent immigrants, who are often poor or survivors of war, civil strife, or economic depression, come from extremely diverse cultures. From 1980 to 1990, Hispanic populations went up by more than 50% and Asian/Pacific Islander presence increased more than 100% (Garcia, 1992). This escalation in cultural and linguistic diversification is particularly evident in the school-age population, in which 2.3 million students are currently identified as having "limited English proficiency" (United States Department of Education, 1992).

There is a growing concern with the failure of second-language learners to keep pace with mainstream native English-speaking students in educational achievement, including reading achievement. For example, Garcia (1992) reports that among Hispanics there is a 35% grade-retention rate, a two-to-four grade-level achievement gap, and a 40% high school dropout rate. In a recent review of research on reading instruction for second-language learners, Fitzgerald (1995b) points out that these achievement figures are not surprising considering the length of time and amount of effort required to learn conversational English and then the more formal or academic language of instruction. Without the necessary communication skills in English it is difficult, if not impossible, for these children to participate successfully in school activities, especially those related to literacy learning. Because reading provides critical access to acquiring new information and helping to develop independence in learning, designing educational environments that support the literacy learning of culturally and linguistically diverse learners must have a high priority (Fitzgerald, 1995b; Gersten & Jimenez, 1994).

In the past, second-language learners have often been taught separately until acquiring a language proficiency level determined by their school or school system. Recently, however, research has suggested the value of having second-language learners mainstreamed (Anzalone, Straub, & Thomas, 1994; Morrow, 1992). These new research findings, along with the rapid increase in the number of immigrants, have encouraged the examination of alternative models. If teachers are to respond successfully to the challenge of teaching second-language learners and native English speakers in the same classroom, thoughtful consideration must be given to the creation of a productive educational setting as well as the design and implementation of instructional activities which are appropriate and effective for both groups (Gersten & Jimenez, 1994).

In our work with students, we have been influenced by theory related to developing expertise (Meichenbaum & Biemiller, 1990). The practical implications for developing reading expertise suggest the importance of creating a learning environment where children read with understanding, feel successful, learn strategies to improve reading, and are motivated to practice. Current research supports the use of similar activities for both first- and second-language learners because literacy learning processes are essentially the same for both groups (Boyle & Peregoy, 1990; Fitzger-

ald, 1995a). However, limited second-language proficiency, background knowledge, and experiences that do not match the content of typical school texts may interfere with the speed and ease of comprehension for second-language learners (Boyle & Peregoy, 1990). In order to foster expertise, the program, materials, and activities must provide many opportunities to develop and practice language and reading skills within a setting that supports and nurtures both the affective and the cognitive aspects of literacy development (Alexander & Entwisle, 1988; Gambrell, 1996; Lau & Cheung, 1988; Oldfather, 1993; Snow, Barnes, Chandler, Goodman, & Hemphill, 1991).

Currently, researchers have begun to develop a more comprehensive and balanced view of reading. This evolving theoretical perspective includes an emphasis on motivation and social interaction, as well as cognition and knowledge acquisition (Brandt, 1990; Csikszentmihaly, 1991; Guice, Allington, Johnston, Baker, & Michelson, 1996; McCombs, 1989; Turner, & Paris, 1995). This view emphasizes the importance of increasing children's motivation to read and the teacher's role in providing this motivation. Research findings suggest that "classroom cultures" that foster reading motivation share certain characteristics, such as a teacher who is a reading model, a book-rich classroom environment, opportunities for choice, familiarity with books, and social interaction about books (Gambrell, 1996; Guice et al., 1996; Oldfather, 1993; Ruddell, 1995; Turner & Paris, 1995).

To supplement their experiences at school, students can also benefit from literacy opportunities in contexts other than the classroom. One important area is the home. The relationship of children's experiences with language and reading at home to their success in learning to read is well-documented (Durkin, 1966; Teale, 1986; Tobin & Pikulski, 1988; Wells, 1985). However, many second-language learners do not have sufficient opportunities to practice English in their homes. These students frequently reach the end of their sixth year of schooling with a cumulative exposure of approximately 40,000 hours of their home language, but only 3,000 hours of English (Elley & Mangubhai, 1983). While research suggests that access to books is another crucial factor in early literacy development (Elley, 1992, 1996; Gambrell, 1993; Morrow, 1992), it has been reported that some second-language learners do not have many books (written in English) available in their home environment (Blum, Koskinen, Tennant, Parker, Straub, & Curry, 1995). Second-language learners who have limited opportunities to practice spoken English and few experiences reading English storybooks at home are likely to be at a disadvantage in their ability to develop literacy skills.

Having more books available appears to be especially helpful to second-language learners because these books provide an alternative source of experience with the target language. In a review of nine evaluative studies, Elley (1991) examined the effects of programs that expose young second-language learners to "book floods," large quantities of high-interest, illustrated storybooks. He reports consistent and stable evidence that children show rapid improvement in reading and listening comprehension, and gains appear to transfer to

all aspects of the child's target language, including grammatical structures and expressive language competence.

Along with the positive impact of book access on oral language, a growing body of evidence indicates that when children have environments that are book-rich, the motivation to read is high (Allington & McGill-Franzen, 1993; Elley, 1992; Gambrell, 1993; Morrow, 1992). In addition, research suggests that increasing the number of books available to children in the classroom can have positive effects on the amount and quality of literacy experiences in the classroom as well as in the home environment (Blum et al., 1995; Gambrell, 1993).

In our efforts to design literacy instructional programs that foster expertise, we have been interested in exploring the benefits of repeated reading with beginning readers in a variety of settings. Our current focus has been on using this strategy as part of a school-home literacy program with children who speak English as a second language (ESL) as well as native English-speaking learners (Blum et al., 1995). Repeated reading involves multiple readings of a text and provides substantial practice in reading connected discourse. This relatively simple rehearsal strategy allows novices to feel like experts as they become more fluent readers (Blum & Koskinen, 1991). Along with other researchers and practitioners, we have been particularly interested in the use of repeated reading to develop fluency (i.e., smooth, accurate, natural, expressive reading) and to encourage motivation with both developing and less proficient readers.

Researchers have examined a variety of repeated reading strategies and their findings demonstrate evidence of improved reading rate and accuracy (Chomsky, 1976; Dahl, 1974; Dowhower, 1987; Herman, 1985; Samuels, 1979), increased vocabulary (Elley, 1989; Koskinen & Blum, 1984; Rasinski, 1990), and enhanced comprehension (Dowhower, 1987; Herman, 1985; O'Shea, Sindelar, & O'Shea, 1985; Yaden, 1988). Repeated reading also enhances self monitoring, one of the behaviors essential for independent reading. Clay (1991) suggests that rereading familiar text is "one way of developing the smooth orchestration of all those behaviors necessary for effective reading" (p. 184). Repeated reading is an activity that engages student interest and often leads to increased confidence in reading (Koskinen & Blum, 1984; Topping, 1987; Trachtenberg & Ferruggia, 1989). Repeated reading has been used in settings where students work individually (Dowhower, 1987; Herman, 1985; Samuels, 1979), and in pairs (Koskinen & Blum, 1984). In addition, researchers have reported successful use of rereading with a live or audiotaped model of the text (Blum et al., 1995; Carbo, 1978; Chomsky, 1976; Gamby, 1983; Shany & Biemiller, 1995).

Because repeated reading allows students at many different instructional levels to participate in the same activity and improve at their own pace, it is a very flexible strategy and can be modified for use in both classroom and home contexts. While there is support in the literature for the in-school use of repeated reading with below-average native English-speaking readers, there is limited research on its use with young native English-speaking

children at home or with second-language learners in either the school or home setting. Repeated reading may have particular benefits for young second-language learners, especially when it is used with an auditory model to support and extend language learning. This auditory model provides a form of scaffolding that is critical for beginning readers (Feitelson, Goldstein, Iraqi, & Share, 1993; Vygotsky, 1978).

To explore the benefits of extending the literacy instructional program into the home context, we conducted a study with first-grade second-language learners (Blum et al., 1995; Koskinen, Blum, Tennant, Parker, Straub, & Curry, 1995). This study used single case methodology to investigate the effects of rereading at home both with and without an audiotaped model. Findings indicate that second-language learners showed substantial growth in their ability to read books of increasing difficulty both fluently and accurately when given the opportunity to reread books with audiotapes at home. In addition, teachers and parents reported that students read more and demonstrated increased confidence and independence in literacy activities.

The encouraging findings from this initial school-home study with audio models suggested the need for systematic investigation with a larger sample of children and teachers to provide more generalizability of results. There was also a need to specify essential features of an effective school-home program. The purpose of this study, therefore, was to investigate whether rereading at home is a significant supplement to the literacy instructional program of second-language learners and native English-speaking students. Of specific interest was exploring the impact of increased access to books and rereading with an audio model on children's reading achievement and motivation. Participation in a book-rich literacy instructional program that included rereading of multi-level patterned books at home with audiotapes was compared with (a) participation in a book-rich program including multi-level patterned books based only in school, and (b) participation in an unmodified instructional reading program. Comparisons were made on measures of fluent oral reading, comprehension, and reading motivation/behavior. In addition, this study investigated whether there was a relationship between students' English language proficiency and their learning of literacy skills through participation in a school-home reading program.

Method

Setting

The study took place in 12 first-grade classrooms located in four elementary schools within a suburban school district near Washington, D.C. Each school served a diverse student population, representing many language, cultural, and socioeconomic groups. The students were in classrooms that had a reduced pupil-teacher ratio (approximately 15 to 1) and five or more students who spoke English as their second language. Some students in each classroom received additional support from the ESL, Title I, or other resource teachers.

As participants in the first-grade reduced-ratio program in the school district, teachers were receiving staff development training. In addition, teachers had the opportunity to take a graduate level course in reading strategies. Training focused on meeting the needs of a diverse population of students, observing student behavior, managing instruction, and using assessment information to plan appropriate instruction for children.

Teachers provided a balanced language arts program with time throughout the day for reading and writing with students. Instruction included activities such as reading aloud, shared reading, shared and interactive writing, focus lessons, and guided reading. Students were given daily opportunities for rereading familiar texts, independent reading, and independent writing. Center-based activities, follow-up activities, and projects were often included within the reading/writing workshop. All classrooms had libraries, and children were encouraged to take books home for recreational reading; however, daily home reading programs with audiotapes were not part of the classroom routines prior to the beginning of this project.

Participants

One hundred and thirty-one first-grade children in 12 classrooms participated in this research study. There were 77 boys and 54 girls who ranged in age from 5 to 7, with an average age of 6 years and 1 month. All children were reading on the pre-emergent or emergent level as determined by the school system's adaptation of Clay's (1993) observation survey. Each classroom had children who spoke both English as their first language and children who spoke English as a second language. Forty-nine students were native speakers of English and 82 students spoke English as a second language. Thirty-two of these second-language students were proficient in English, as determined by the school system's ESL Proficiency Rating Scale, and received no additional English language support services. Fifty of these second-language students were designated by the school system as eligible for English language support services. The English language proficiency of those students receiving support services included 24 students on Level A (lowest level of proficiency), 12 students on Level B1, 10 students on Level B2, and 4 students on Level C (highest level, nearing proficiency).

In this study, the students' parents came from more than 23 countries and 13 different languages were spoken. The primary languages that the participating children and parents used to communicate with each other at home were as follows: English (54), Spanish (38), Chinese (2), Vietnamese (22), Arabic (2), Urdu (3), Korean (1), Turkish (1), Laotian (1), Cambodian (1), Amharic (4), Cantonese (1), and Tagalog (1).

Design

A quasi-experimental design was used in this research study. From the pool of volunteers, three intact first-grade classrooms in each of four schools were randomly assigned to one of the following three treatment groups: (a) structured shared reading at school and reread-

ing of books with audiotapes at home (SRSBAH), (b) structured shared reading at school (SRS), or (c) unmodified school reading (Control). Students in the SRSBAH classes participated in the school intervention with many multi-level patterned books that included audiotapes and books packaged for home use; students in the SRS classes participated in the school intervention with many multi-level patterned books, but did not have books and audiotapes for home use. Participants in the Control classes continued their regular reading instructional program. The school-home versus control comparison evaluated the effect of the classroom shared reading and rereading of multi-level books plus home rereading with audio support relative to the unmodified reading instruction (control). The structured shared reading at school versus the control comparison assessed the effect of structured shared reading and rereading of multi-level books in the classroom relative to unmodified reading instruction. Comparisons between the school-home and the school-only interventions permitted a test of the effect of adding a home component that included books and audiotapes, as opposed to using only the school-based shared reading and rereading of multi-level books.

Each treatment group contained students of varying levels of English language proficiency. These included: (a) ESL students with support services (ESL w/services), (b) ESL students without support services (ESL w/o services), and (c) native English-speaking students (NES). Including English proficiency level as an independent variable provided an opportunity to assess the interaction of treatment with proficiency.

Instructional Materials

The instructional materials used in this study were developed in a previous study (Blum et al., 1995; Koskinen et al., 1995) and were used successfully with ESL students. The teacher researchers who participated in the development of these materials also used them with NES students who were beginning readers and reported that they were equally appropriate for these children as well. Similar to some homes of ESL children, some NES children also need to have access to additional developmentally appropriate books at home for daily home reading. The materials used in the Blum et al. (1995) study and the present study were developed so students would have successful initial experiences with storybook reading. The short books with repetitive language patterns that were used in the classroom were also appropriate for use at home. Audiotapes were incorporated in the home-reading activity of the SRSBAH group to provide support for oral reading and enable children to read independently. They also provided a model for children whose parents did not speak English or were not available to help. In addition, because many beginning readers are not in the habit of daily reading, special care was given to developing procedures for daily routines and packaging of materials to facilitate book access and encourage reading at home. The following materials were used in the study.

Books

The shared and repeated reading in this project was conducted with short books written in English. These books contain familiar concepts and vocabulary with commonly used oral language patterns. In addition, illus-

trations depict the meaning and language of the text. The gradually increasing levels of difficulty (beginning with single-word labels and two-word sentences and moving to complex text with literary language) provide an opportunity for emergent readers to have successful experiences with print. Consequently, these books are particularly appropriate for second-language learners, as well as beginning readers who are native speakers of English.

One hundred and fifty-four different books were used in this study, ranging in difficulty from emergent to independent first-grade level (see Appendix). In each class there were two copies of each title, color-coded to assist with the organization and management of project materials and activities. One copy, marked with a red dot, was used for in-class reading after it had been introduced; a second, marked with a yellow dot, was packaged along with an audiotape of the story for home use. The "packages" consisted of plastic bags with the book's title written on the front. Each book was numbered and a library pocket was affixed to the back inside cover so that it could be checked out for home use.

Audiotapes

Audiotapes were made for all project books by native English-speaking adults, and the text was read exactly as presented. On each of the tapes, the reader stated the book's title along with the name of the author and illustrator. Students were then directed to the story and encouraged by the reader to "Put your finger under the first word and follow along as I read." The book's text was then read expressively, but at a pace that would allow beginning readers to match oral and written words. Students were also given at least three seconds to turn the page after they were given a signal indicating that they should do so. This amount of time allowed the young readers to both look at the pictures and physically turn the page.

Tape Recorders

Battery-operated tape recorders with simple controls were provided for each participating child. The children were taught how to use the tape recorder and were given one for their personal use during the project. Then, the children were instructed to take the tape recorder home so they could read along with the taped books each night.

Backpacks

Backpacks, marked with the project title, "Dog Gone Good Reading," and designated expressly for the purpose of carrying reading materials to and from school, were given to each child for his or her use during the project. This packaging was designed to provide a motivating and convenient way to transport materials, and also to help children remember to read on a daily basis.

Check-out/Check-in Chart

To assist with management of the daily book exchange, a poster board chart was used. This chart, with the project logo (dog mascot) and title, "Dog Gone Good Reading," contained each child's name printed on a library

card pocket that was glued on the board. The children were taught to remove the library card from the back of their book and place it in their pocket on the chart when they checked out a book and tape. When they checked in materials, they retrieved the card from their chart pocket and replaced the card in the book.

Teacher Training Materials

All teachers received the same information and written packets of training materials for an orientation session and pre/posttesting procedures. Parallel procedures were developed for treatment sessions. The orientation session with teachers in each school provided an overview of the project's purposes and procedures. Details related to the criteria for student participants, random assignment of classes, instructional materials to be used and general assessment activities were shared in this introductory session. In addition, the eventual distribution of materials was discussed. The three teachers in each school were aware that they would be participating in different activities and that all project materials (books, audiotapes, etc.) would be divided equally among participating teachers at the end of the study.

Training guidelines were prepared for all groups. Written procedures were given to the two treatment groups that had instructional interventions. Teachers in the SRSBAH group received guidelines for (a) conducting classroom shared reading, (b) planning for rereading at home, (c) suggestions for getting started with books and audiotapes at home, and (d) maintaining home use of books and audiotapes. The SRS group received training materials for classroom-shared reading that were the same as those used in the SRSBAH group. No formal written procedures were given to the Control group because they were following their regular reading procedures and did not have an intervention to implement. Their treatment training time, however, was equal to the other two groups and was spent discussing the details of their language arts program.

During the sessions that involved assessment activities training, participating teachers in each school received packets of materials for the pretests at the beginning of the study and then another packet of materials for posttesting at the end of the study. Each assessment measure included written directions for administration that reflected the procedures presented in the assessment training sessions.

Assessment Materials

The assessment instruments used in this study included: the Oral Reading Assessment, the Writing Vocabulary Assessment, the Beginning Reading Assessment, the Oral Story Retelling Assessment, the English Language Proficiency Assessment, the Me and My Reading Scale, as well as Student, Parent, and Teacher Surveys and Interviews. The following is a description of each measure.

Literacy and Language Achievement Measures

Oral reading assessment. To provide an estimate of fluent oral reading level, children's oral reading was observed and coded using a procedure referred to by Marie Clay (1993) as

a "running record." The materials for this task, which were adapted from Clay's observation survey (1993), include a set of leveled books that had been selected and used as part of the school system's Title I assessment. The levels of difficulty were identified as "emergent reader," "novice reader," "apprentice reader," and "developing reader." After a brief book introduction, a child read one of two available books at each level until he or she fell below a word accuracy rate of 90%. The highest level at which a child scored 90% or above was considered his or her instructional reading level. This task was administered by the classroom teacher as both a pretest and a posttest.

Writing vocabulary assessment. The Writing Vocabulary Assessment, adapted from Clay's observation survey (1993), provides a sample of words the child can write independently. Clay suggests that such a writing sample can provide information about some of the features of print to which children are attending, their knowledge about letters and letter sequencing, details of letter formation, letter order, word configuration, and visual discrimination of print. In this study, the writing task was administered to students in groups of four. They were given 10 minutes to write all the words they knew, beginning with their own name. To initiate testing, teachers provided brief writing prompts, such as: "Do you know how to write 'cat'?" or "Do you know how to write any other animal words like 'dog'?" Credit was given for every word the student wrote accurately. This measure was used as a pretest and posttest.

Beginning reading assessment. The Beginning Reading Assessment (BRA), adapted from Clay's observation survey (1993), was used as a pretest-only measure to determine children's knowledge about concepts of print and the conventions for written language. Clay suggests that knowledge of these concepts has proved to be a sensitive indicator of behaviors that support reading acquisition. This 11-item individually administered measure is appropriate for emergent readers and identifies students' understanding of concepts, such as print (rather than pictures) contains the message, the term "letter," the term "word," the one-to-one match between a spoken word and a word in print, and the reading of print in English moves from left to right. Because some of the students in this study were emergent readers with limited oral reading or writing ability, the teacher-administered BRA provided another measure with which to determine the comparability of treatment groups.

Oral story retelling assessment. This holistic comprehension measure demonstrates students' ability to construct meaning through a verbal retelling. The retelling posttest task, which was part of the school system's first-grade diagnostic procedures, included a book that was of interest to first-grade children and was chosen for quality of plot structure, including strongly delineated characters, definite setting, obvious plot episodes, and clear resolution. This individually administered activity involved listening to an audiotape of the story while looking at the book and then orally retelling the story. To facilitate retelling, teachers used prompts such as: "Where did the story happen?" and "Who was in the story?" These assisted oral retellings were tape recorded and later transcribed for story grammar analysis. A template

of the story's characters, setting, plot episodes, and resolution was used in the analysis of each transcribed retelling. The interrater reliability for the scoring of 60 randomly selected retellings was .94.

English language proficiency assessment. Second-language learners had been assessed and assigned an English language proficiency rating by the school system prior to the beginning of this study. When appropriate, this rating was used to assign students to one of the study's three different English proficiency groups: (a) ESL students with services, (b) ESL students without services, and (c) native English speakers. At the end of the study, to assess growth in second-language learners' English proficiency, the language proficiency classification determined by the ESL teacher in the school was used. This rating was based on the student's performance on a set of assessment measures that included three components: (a) speaking and listening through story retelling, (b) a writing sample using a picture as a prompt, and (c) an oral reading component. The ratings, A, B1, B2, and C, ranged from A (lowest level of proficiency in English) to C (nearing proficiency).

Motivational/Behavioral Surveys

Me and My Reading Scale. This 15-item survey (Gambrell, 1993) was used as a posttest measure to assess students' reading motivation and literacy behavior. The survey, which has a reliability of .68, includes items with a Likert scale as well as forced choice responses to questions about (a) individual and family reading habits, and (b) attitudes toward books, reading, and being read to. Teachers administered surveys to small groups of children, reading each item aloud. Pictures were also provided on the survey to help teachers guide the children from one question to the next.

Individual child observation surveys. A 12-item survey, using a Likert-scale response, was used as a pretest and posttest to assess teachers' perceptions of individual student's reading motivation and behavior. The survey, which was completed by each child's teacher, focused on the child's reading habits in school and attitude toward books. For children who used books in the classroom only, the posttest survey included four additional items that related to child engagement with project materials, child interest in reading, and the impact of the project on reading achievement. The posttest survey for children who used books and tapes at home also had four additional items. These focused on student independence in completing the activity, attitude toward reading, and reading achievement.

Child interview. At the conclusion of the study, an eight-item individual interview was conducted by the teachers of children who had used books and tapes at home. Questions provided an opportunity for children to comment on how frequently they engaged in the books and tapes activity, whether they enjoyed the activity, and their view of its impact on their learning to read.

Parent surveys. To assess parents' perceptions of their child's reading motivation/behavior and to explore parents' perception of the treatment effectiveness, parents were asked to complete a written survey at the beginning and again at the end of the study.

The pretest survey included 12 items with a Likert-scale response related to child and family reading habits, as well as child attitudes toward books. An additional open-ended response item asked parents to comment on what their child liked best about school. At the conclusion of the study, this survey was administered again. Parents of children who had used books and tapes at home were asked to respond to nine additional questions using a Likert-scale response. These questions were related to the frequency of book and tape use, the child's response to the books and tapes activity, and the child's engagement with books. Three additional open-ended questions asked parents to elaborate on both the child's and their own response to the books and tapes activity. Translated surveys were provided for parents who did not speak English.

Parent telephone interview. At the conclusion of the study, a phone interview was conducted with selected parents of children who had used books and tapes at home. In each classroom using the books and tapes at home, three parents of second-language learners who received ESL services and three parents of native English speakers were randomly selected to be interviewed. Interview questions related to the parents' observation of their child's reading behavior in terms of interest, amount of time spent reading, attitude toward books, student independence in completing the books and tapes activity, and mechanical operation of the tape recorder. Interpreters fluent in the parents' languages were available to assist with the interviews if needed.

Classroom survey. A Classroom Survey (Gambrell, 1993) was used at the beginning of the study. This survey consisted of 14 items providing descriptive information related to the experience of the teacher, materials used for reading instruction, the use of literature in the classroom, and the motivational level of the students.

Teacher questionnaire. All teachers completed a written questionnaire at the conclusion of the study. The basic questionnaire included eight items with both Likert-scale and yes/no response formats. Questions focused on the teacher's in-school reading programs, use of school-home reading programs, and availability of materials. For teachers using the books in school, the questionnaire included additional items related to their use of project materials, project organization and management, and the impact of the project on students' attitude toward reading and reading achievement. The questionnaire for teachers using the books and tapes at home, included additional items related to their use of project materials and the impact of the project on students' attitudes and achievement.

Final teacher interview. An interview was conducted at the end of the study with all the teachers involved. Questions in the interview were similar to those in the Teacher Questionnaire. The interview, conducted by the Title 1 research assistants, provided an opportunity for teachers to confirm and elaborate on their questionnaire responses.

Procedures

In October, four Title 1 schools were selected to participate in this study. All the schools had at least three first-grade teachers who had

volunteered to be a part of this seven-month project. Researchers who were also Title 1 Program Assistants conducted an initial orientation with teachers in each school. This session provided an overview of the research project, including random assignment of classes to treatment groups and assessment measures to be used.

A second session was conducted with the teachers in each school to introduce the specific pretest measures they would be using in the project. The teachers were given assessment packages that contained all the necessary measures, and then the detailed written guidelines for administration were discussed. Many of the teachers, however, were familiar with most of the assessment measures because they had participated in a one-semester graduate-level course. This course provided considerable practice in the administration of the school system first-grade evaluation measures, three of which were used as pretests in this study.

To obtain baseline information about the participating students, teachers administered the following measures: the Beginning Reading Assessment; the Writing Vocabulary Assessment; and the Oral Reading Assessment. The teachers also completed an Individual Child Observation Survey for each student and a survey about her classroom instructional activities. In addition, the teachers sent a reading behavior survey home to the parents and obtained ESL proficiency ratings for second-language learners from the ESL resource teacher in each school. Researchers were in close communication with the teachers and were available to provide assistance when needed.

During October, teachers in each school were randomly assigned to one of three treatment groups: (a) structured shared reading at school and rereading of books with audiotapes at home (SRSBAH), (b) structured shared reading at school (SRS), or (c) unmodified school reading (Control). Teachers in the SRSBAH treatment group, which involved structured shared reading at school and rereading of books with audiotapes at home, participated in a training session that used procedures and materials developed in the Blum et al. (1995) study. The teachers began intervention activities by introducing the project books. Initially, a new book was introduced to students each day by the teacher. This five-minute shared reading procedure included: (a) an oral look-through with the children making predictions based on pictures and the teacher providing key vocabulary and examples of language patterns necessary for independent reading, (b) an oral reading of the book by the teacher, and (c) a rereading of the book with the children.

After two weeks of daily reading of the project books, the children were introduced to procedures for taking books and audiotapes home. A second copy of each book that had been shared in class was placed with an audiotape in a special basket for home use. Because these books and audiotapes were in yellow color-coded packages, they were easily identified by the students. A routine was established for checking out the book and audiotape packages and returning the packages to the classroom. Backpacks were provided to transport books and tapes to and from home.

Each child in the SRSBAH treatment group also was given a tape recorder to keep at home

for the duration of the project. In addition to teaching the children how to use this machine, the teacher helped children think specifically about where they would do their home reading (location) and where at home they would store their tape recorder. Students took books home on a daily basis so they could practice reading them with the audiotape at least three times to themselves or a family member. While children were directed to choose at least one book they could read, they were also permitted to take additional books from the set that had been previously introduced. Also, during this time, the home-based reading project was described to the parents, and they were asked to remind their child to listen to and read the books they were bringing home. While parent support as listeners and assistants was invited and encouraged, children could participate in this home-reading project without direct parental involvement. During the seven-month intervention period, teachers were asked to monitor home use of books by (a) having students share one of the books they read at home with a partner, and (b) marking a weekly reading chart to note how frequently each child took books and audiotapes home.

Teachers in the SRS treatment group, which involved structured reading in schools, followed the same procedures as the SRSBAH treatment group for in-class shared reading of new project books. After the book introductions, the SRS students had books available for rereading in their classrooms. These children did not have extra books or audiotapes to take home; however, they participated in the regular school program that encouraged reading at home.

The Control group classes followed their regular reading program that involved some shared reading of materials and encouraged reading at home. Instruction in these classes, however, was not supplemented with project books, audiotaped stories, or tape recorders.

At the end of the study, in late May and early June, data were collected from students, teachers, and parents to assess the effectiveness of the treatment activities. Assessment measures included: (a) the Oral Reading Assessment, (b) the Writing Vocabulary Assessment, (c) the Oral Retelling Assessment, (d) an ESL proficiency rating to indicate English language proficiency of participating second-language learners, and (e) child, teacher, and parent surveys/interviews related to children's reading/motivation behavior and teacher interviews related to the value of school-initiated home reading programs. The Parent Surveys were translated into Spanish, Korean, and Vietnamese and interviews were conducted with interpreters for parents of second-language learners who did not speak English.

Results

Both quantitative and qualitative procedures were used to analyze the data from this study. One-way and two-way analysis of variance and co-variance procedures, as well as chi square procedures, were employed to analyze literacy and language achievement data, including the Oral Reading Assessment, the Writing Vocabulary Assessment, the Oral Story Retelling Assessment, and the ESL Proficiency Rating. These procedures were also used to analyze the Me and My Reading Scale, and portions of the

Table 1
Means and Standard Deviations for Literacy Achievement Measures

	Treatment Groups		
	SRSBAH	SRS	Control
Measure	*M* (*SD*, *N*)	*M* (*SD*, *N*)	*M* (*SD*, *N*)
Oral Reading Level	3.98 (1.35, 46)	3.66 (1.58, 44)	3.82 (1.40, 41)
Writing Vocabulary	32.82 (15.05, 46)	34.37 (25.13, 43)	34.64 (12.35, 39)
Oral Retelling	13.11 (4.32, 45)[a]	14.59 (4.18, 44)[a]	11.10 (3.84, 41)[b]

Note: Scores are significantly different ($p < .01$) if they do not have the same superscript.

student, parent, and teacher survey data. Post hoc comparisons were conducted for analyses with significant differences using the Fisher's LSD multiple comparisons to determine which between-group differences were significant. In addition, descriptive procedures were used for selected portions of the survey and interview data.

Preliminary data analysis focused upon the comparability of the three treatment groups, including two experimental groups (school-home reading with audiotapes [SRSBAH] and school rereading [SRS]) and one control group. Analysis of variance (ANOVA) revealed there were no statistically significant differences among treatment groups on oral reading pretest levels (SRSBAH, $M = 1.61$; SRS, $M = 1.59$; Control, $M = 1.54$; $F(2, 128) = .24$, $p = .79$), the Beginning Reading Assessment pretest (SRSBAH, $M = 7.20$; SRS, $M = 7.65$; Control, $M = 7.93$; $F(2, 125) = 1.07$, $p = .35$), or the writing vocabulary pretest scores (SRSBAH, $M = 9.11$; SRS, $M = 9.26$; Control, $M = 6.74$; $F(2,125) = 1.81$, $p = .17$).

A chi square analysis (chi square = 3.13; $df = 4$; $p = .54$) determined that there were no significant differences among treatment groups on the distribution of students from the three language proficiency groups (ESL w/ services, ESL w/o services, and NES). In addition, there were no significant differences among treatment groups on pretest proficiency levels for the ESL w/services group (SRSBAH, $M = 2.14$; SRS, $M = 1.82$; Control, $M = 1.50$; $F(2, 47) = 1.65$, $p = .20$). (It should be noted that the other two proficiency groups were not pretested or posttested because they had been evaluated previously and were considered proficient speakers of English.)

Literacy and Language Achievement

Literacy and language achievement dependent variables consisted of oral reading, writing vocabulary, story retelling scores, and English language proficiency. Posttest means and standard deviation for these literacy achievement scores are presented in Tables 1 and 2.

Table 2
Means and Standard Deviations for Oral Reading Level, Writing Vocabulary, and Oral Retelling by Level of English Language Proficiency

	Level of English Language Proficiency		
	ESL w/ Services	ESL w/o Services	NES
Measure	*M* (*SD*, *N*)	*M* (*SD*, *N*)	*M* (*SD*, *N*)
Oral Reading Level	3.47 (1.66, 50)[a]	3.74 (1.37, 32)	4.25 (.94, 49)[b]
Writing Vocabulary	34.59 (18.43, 49)	32.49 (16.62, 32)	34.76 (19.27, 47)
Oral Retelling	12.19 (5.04, 49)	12.56 (3.82, 32)	14.05 (3.81, 49)

Note: Posttest scores are significantly different ($p < .05$) if they do not have the same superscript.

Oral Reading Assessment

A two-way analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) was used to determine if there were differences among treatment groups on oral reading level posttests. The oral reading pretest was used as a covariate for this posttest reading level analysis. There were no statistically significant differences among treatment groups on oral reading level and there were no significant interactions between treatment and English proficiency level. There were, however, significant differences by proficiency level on reading level between the ESL with services and the NES groups, $F(2,121) = 3.75$, $p < .05$. As expected, post hoc comparisons revealed that NES group scores were higher than the ESL with services group. Means and standard deviations are shown in Table 2.

Writing Vocabulary Assessment

A two-way ANCOVA with the vocabulary pretest as a covariate was used to determine if there were differences among groups on the writing vocabulary posttest. There were no statistically significant differences among treatment groups on writing vocabulary and there were also no significant interactions between treatment and English proficiency level. In addition, there were no significant differences by proficiency level on writing vocabulary.

Oral Story Retelling Assessment

The two-way ANOVA of the oral story retelling scores revealed significant differences among treatment groups on this listening comprehension measure, $F(2, 121) = 7.37$, $p < .01$. Post hoc comparisons revealed that both the SRSBAH and SRS groups' scores were significantly higher than the Control group's scores. There were no significant interactions between treatment and English language proficiency. There also were no significant differences by proficiency level on story retelling scores.

Table 3
Means and Standard Deviations for the Me and My Reading Scale

	Treatment Groups		
	SRSBAH	SRS	Control
Measure	*M* (*SD*, *N*)	*M* (*SD*, *N*)	*M* (*SD*, *N*)
Me and My Reading	34.91 (3.79, 46)[a]	34.98 (4.86, 44)[a]	32.17 (6.87, 41)[b]

Note: Scores are significantly different ($p < .05$) if they do not have the same superscript.

English Language Proficiency Assessment

A one-way ANCOVA was used to determine if there were differences among treatment groups on the English language proficiency posttest levels of ESL students who received English language support services. An analysis using the English language proficiency pretest level as a covariate revealed no significant differences among treatment groups.

Motivation/Behavior Measures

Me and My Reading Scale

A two-way ANOVA of the total scores on the Me and My Reading Scale revealed no significant differences among treatment groups or language proficiency levels. The *p* value for treatment groups, however, was nearly significant for treatment $F(2, 122) = 2.99$, $p = .0538$, so a reanalysis of the data was conducted without proficiency levels. A one-way ANOVA revealed treatment to be significant $F(2, 128) = 3.91$, $p = .022$. Means and standard deviations are presented in Table 3. Post hoc comparisons revealed that the scores of the SRSBAH and the SRS groups were significantly higher than the Control group's scores.

Individual Child Observation Survey (ICOS)

A two-way ANCOVA was conducted on the 12 items of the ICOS which were completed by teachers in all three treatment groups. The ICOS pretest score for each item was used as a covariate. Teachers' observations of individual children revealed statistically significant differences among treatment groups on five items. Means and standard deviations are displayed in Table 4. The five questions with post hoc analyses are as follows: (a) "Does the student take books home from school?", $F(2,98) = 13.35$, $p < .0001$; and (b) "If the student has free time, would he/she choose to read a book?", $F(2,118) = 5.61$, $p < .01$. Post hoc comparisons revealed that the SRSBAH group's scores were significantly higher than SRS and Control groups' scores. (c) "Does the student enjoy listening to stories at the listening center?", $F(2,118) = 5.09$, $p < .01$. Post hoc comparisons revealed that the SRS group's scores were significantly higher than the SRSBAH and the Control's scores. (d)

Table 4
Means and Standard Deviations for the Individual Child Observation Survey

Item (1–4 scale)	Treatment Groups		
	SRSBAH	SRS	Control
	M (*SD*, *N*)	*M* (*SD*, *N*)	*M* (*SD*, *N*)
1. Does the student take books home from school? Seldom/Once a week/2 or 3 times a week/Nearly every day	3.71 (.75, 43)[a]	2.89 (.96, 35)[b]	2.81 (.96, 30)[b*]
2. If the student has free time, would he/she choose to read a book? Never/Seldom/Sometimes/Most of the time	3.27 (.70, 43)[a]	2.88 (.80, 44)[b]	2.80 (.60, 41)[b***]
3. Does the student enjoy listening to stories at the listening center? Not at all/Not very much/Some/Very much	3.42 (.62, 43)[a]	3.77 (.45, 44)[b]	3.47 (.50, 41)[a***]
4. Does the student's conversation contain references to books he/she has read? Never/Not very often/Sometimes/Often	3.03 (.53, 43)[a]	2.85 (.66, 42)[a]	2.52 (.51, 41)[b**]
5. Is the student's writing influenced by books he/she has read? Never/Not very often/Sometimes/Often			
ESL with services	2.88 (.48, 21)[a]	2.14 (1.01, 15)[b]	2.27 (.75, 12)[b***]
ESL without services	2.12 (.67, 8)[a]	3.32 (1.05, 9)[b]	2.10 (1.08, 12)[a**]

Note: Scores are significantly different if they do not have the same superscript.
* $p < .0001$. ** $p < .001$. *** $p < .01$.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

"Does the student's conversation contain references to books he/she has read?", $F(2, 116) = 8.51, p < .001$. Post hoc analysis revealed that the SRSBAH and SRS groups' scores were significantly higher than the Control group's scores. (e) "Is the student's writing influenced by books he/she has read?", $F(4,115) = 4.16$, $p < .01$. Because a two-way ANCOVA revealed a significant interaction between treatment and proficiency, two subsequent one-way ANCOVAs were conducted with post hoc analyses. In the SRSBAH group, ESL students with services had significantly higher scores than the ESL students with services in the SRS and Control groups, $F(2,44) = 5.62, p < .01$. Also, in the SRS group, ESL students without services had significantly higher scores than the ESL students without services in the SRSBAH and the Control groups, $F(2, 25) = 9.28, p < .001$. There were no significant interactions with the NES group.

A two-way ANOVA was used to analyze data on two additional ICOS items (parallel statements) that were appropriate for only the SRSBAH and SRS treatment groups. Means and standard deviations are shown in Table 5. On the item "Participating in the 'Dog Gone Good' books and tapes project increased the student's interest in reading," $F(2,83) = 44.87$, $p < .0001$, the SRSBAH group's scores were significantly higher than the SRS group's scores. There were also significant differences in proficiency level for the SRSBAH group. A one-way ANOVA revealed that the scores for the ESL students with services were significantly higher than the scores of students in the ESL without services or the NES groups (ESL w/services $M = 3.81$; ESL w/o services, $M = 3.27$; NES, $M = 3.36$; $F(2,43) = 3.59, p < .05$). On the statement "Participating in the 'Dog Gone Good' books and tapes project increased the student's reading achievement," $F(2,82) = 34.54$, $p < .0001$, the SRSBAH group's scores were significantly higher than the SRS group's scores. There were no significant differences by proficiency level.

One item in the ICOS was addressed only by teachers in the SRSBAH group (see Table 5). For the question, "Does the student remember to take the 'Dog Gone Good' books/tapes home and then bring them back to school on his/her own?" mean response was high ($M = 3.67$) and an ANOVA revealed a significant difference in proficiency level, $F(2, 43) = 3.52, p < .05$. Post hoc comparison revealed that the scores of ESL students with services were significantly higher than students' scores in the ESL without services and the NES groups.

Descriptive measures were used to analyze the SRSBAH and SRS groups' teachers' responses to the question "What did the student like best about the 'Dog Gone Good' reading project?" Categories of their answers with the number of responses are presented in Table 6. Teachers of children in the SRSBAH group most frequently mentioned that students liked reading more books ($N = 9$), reading with friends and family ($N = 9$), and taking books home ($N = 9$). Teachers of the SRSBAH group also noted that students liked having reading homework ($N = 7$), specifically that they liked using the tape with the book ($N = 6$), that children liked rereading the books ($N = 5$), and that children liked having some

Table 5
Means and Standard Deviations for the Individual Child Observation Survey (SRSBAH and SRS Groups Only)

	Item (1-4 scale)	Treatment Groups	
		SRSBAH	SRS
		M (*SD*, *N*)	*M* (*SD*, *N*)
1A.	Participating in the "Dog Gone Good" books and tapes projects increased the student's interest in reading. (SRSBAH)	3.48 (.66, 46)[a]	2.40 (.82, 43)[b*]
1B.	Participating in the "Dog Gone Good" books project increased the student's interest in reading. (SRS) Not at all/A little/Some/Very much		
2A.	Participating in the "Dog Gone Good" books and tapes project increased the student's reading achievement. (SRSBAH)	3.36 (.72, 46)[a]	2.27 (.94, 42)[b*]
2B.	Participating in the "Dog Gone Good" books project increased the student's reading achievement. (SRS) Not at all/A little/Some/Very much		
3.	Does the student remember to take the "Dog Gone Good" books and tapes home and then bring them back to school on his/her own? (SRSBAH only) Never/Seldom/Sometimes/Most of the time	3.67 (.70, 46)	
	ESL with services	3.95 (.22, 21)[c**]	
	ESL without services	3.36 (1.03, 11)[b]	
	NES	3.50 (.76, 14)[b]	

Note: Scores are significantly different if they do not have the same superscript.
* $p < .0001$. ** $p < .05$.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 6

Categories with Number of Responses for Question #16 in the Individual Child Observation Survey— Question 16: What did the student like best about the "Dog Gone Good" reading project?

	Treatment Groups	
Category	SRSBAH	SRS
Reading more books	9	27
Having books and tapes with a recorder at home	11	0
Reading with friends and family	9	10
Taking books home	9	0
Having homework	7	0
Rereading books	5	3

thing special (i.e., the book and tape) for themselves (N = 5). Teachers in the SRS group most often mentioned that children liked the opportunity to read more books (N = 27) and frequently mentioned that children liked reading with friends and family (N = 10).

Child Interview

To gain specific information about using books and tapes at home, ANOVA and descriptive procedures were used to analyze interview responses by children in the SRSBAH group. Questions in this conversational interview conducted by the classroom teacher focused on how much students practiced reading, whether children felt they could manage the activity independently, their response to the materials, and their view of the impact of the activity on their reading achievement. Means and percentages for items are displayed in Table 7.

In response to the question related to the amount of practice, 75% of all the SRSBAH students reported they practiced reading with the books and tapes almost every day. Within the SRSBAH group, however, there were significant differences among English proficiency levels with the students in the ESL with services group reporting significantly higher amounts of practice than students in the ESL w/o services (ESL w/services, M = 3.90; ESL w/o services, M = 2.82; NES, M = 3.50; $F(2,41) = 5.74$, $p < .01$).

Many of the children (80%) indicated that using books and tapes helped them learn to read "a lot." In commenting on why, children most frequently mentioned the value of tapes in helping to identify words and the benefit of practice. Some specific comments made by the

Table 7

Means and Percentage for Items in the Individual Child Interview (SRSBAH Group)

A.* When you took the books and tapes home, did you have a chance to practice reading with them?
$M = 3.52$ ($N = 44$)

Not much	Once a week	Two or three days a week	Almost every day
9%	5%	11%	75%

B.* Do you think that practicing with the books and tapes helps you learn to read?
$M = 2.78$ ($N = 46$)

It doesn't help	It helps some	It helps a lot
2%	17%	80%

C. Do you like reading the books and tapes at home? $M = 3.67$ ($N = 41$)

Not at all	A little	Some	A lot
4%	4%	11%	80%

D.* Does someone at home listen when you practice with your books and tapes?
$M = 2.72$ ($N = 46$)

Not much	Once a week	Two or three days a week	Almost every day
37%	4%	9%	50%

E.* Did you ever have any problems using the books, tapes, and tape recorder?
$M = 1.31$ ($N = 39$)

No	Yes
69%	31%

F.* Would you like to take books and tapes home again in the second grade?
$M = 1.88$ ($N = 40$)

No	Yes
13%	88%

G.* Do you think that I should have books and tapes for the first graders in my class next year?
$M = 2.00$ ($N = 41$)

No	Yes
—	100%

* Scale reversed on original survey.

students included: "The book has a lot of words you don't know and the tape shows you what they are"; "If I don't know which word to read, I just put the tape on and they help me which word it is"; "Before I didn't know the words and I was just making them up"; and "It helps me learn from reading."

Eighty percent of the students reported that they liked to use the books and tapes at home "a lot." There were, however, significant differences among English proficiency levels on this item. Students in both the ESL with services and ESL without services groups were significantly more positive about the home reading activity than the NES group (ESL w/services, $M = 3.86$; ESL w/o services, $M = 3.91$; NES, $M = 3.21$; $F(2,43) = 4.20$, $p < .05$). In commenting on why they liked the activity, children most frequently mentioned they felt the activity helped them learn to read and that they enjoyed it. Some specific comments made by the children were: "If we get hard books, it teach us how to read"; "The tapes helped me out with reading"; "It's fun taking books home from school"; and "It was fun reading with the tape."

The book and audiotape activity was specifically designed so that children could complete it independently; however, the involvement of other family members was encouraged. We were interested to note that more than 60% of the children reported that other family members listened while they read at least once a week, and 50% reported that someone listened to them read every day. Although children most frequently responded that their mother listened to them, their father and siblings were also frequently mentioned as listeners. About half the children indicated they completed the activity without help or reminders. Those children who noted they had help in remembering to practice indicated that a family member, such as mother, father, or sibling, had reminded them.

About one-third of the children reported having problems using the books, tapes, and tape recorders. These problems, however, were only minor mechanical problems involving batteries or operating the tape recorder. Their responses indicated that in almost every case the child was able to get assistance from a family member who resolved the problem.

Children were very enthusiastic about the prospect of continuing to use books and tapes in second grade. They most frequently commented that the activity helped them to learn and that they enjoyed it. Some specific comments included: "We could learn more better and we could read hard books"; "So I could read better and better"; "Because I like reading along with the tapes"; and "Because I would like to learn to read better than I read now, but I still don't like reading."

One hundred percent of the children thought the teacher should use books and tapes with next year's first-graders. They most frequently commented that using the books and tapes would help next year's first-graders learn to read and that it was an activity other beginning readers would enjoy. Children made comments such as: "It would be fun for them too and they can learn how to read"; "Because they'll read better"; "They'll want to listen to the tape recorder"; and "Because when the kids read them, they can have fun and learn so many words."

Parent Survey

A two-way analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) was used to determine if there were differences among treatment groups on 12 individual items on the Parent Survey posttest. These items were completed by parents in all three treatment groups. The Parent Survey pretest was used as a covariate for these analyses. There were statistically significant differences among treatment groups on only one of these items, "Does your child bring books home from school?" SRSBAH, $M = 3.73$; SRS, $M = 3.09$; Control, $M = 3.14$; $F(2,101) = 11.00$, $p < .0001$. Post hoc analysis revealed that the SRSBAH group's scores were significantly higher than SRS and Control groups' scores. There were no significant differences by English proficiency level on this item.

Descriptive procedures were used to analyze the responses from the question "What does your child like best about school?" "Reading" was most frequently mentioned in both the SRSBAH and SRS groups (SRSBAH, $N = 27$; SRS, $N = 27$; Control = 10). "Playing with others/recess/play time" was also frequently mentioned by parents (SRSBAH, $N = 14$; SRS, $N = 19$; Control, $N = 13$).

Means and percentages for the nine items from the Parent Survey that were addressed only by the parents in the SRSBAH group are displayed in Table 8. It should be noted that the majority of parents whose children brought home books and audiotapes reported that their child: (1) remembered to bring home and return books "most of the time" (76%), (2) read along with the audiotapes "almost every day" (64%), (3) "often" looked at the book while listening to the audiotape (88%), (4) was helped "a lot" in their reading by the books and tapes (59%), and (5) enjoyed listening to and reading with the tape recorder "a lot" (70%). In addition, 70% of the parents reported that using the books and tapes increased their child's interest in reading "a lot."

Parent Interview

To learn more about the effectiveness of using books and tapes at home, parents of three second-language learners and three native English speakers in each SRSBAH classroom were randomly selected to be interviewed by telephone. Fifteen parents (eight parents of ESL with services students and seven parents of NES students) were contacted and completed the interviews. Descriptive procedures were used to analyze their responses to the interview questions.

Most parents ($N = 11$) reported that children engaged in the books and tape activity every day and all the parents reported that children read along with the tapes at least twice a week. When asked if their child pays attention to the words in the books while he/she listens, parents frequently noted behaviors such as the child looking at the book while listening and pointing to words ($N = 6$) or the child reading a book back to parents ($N = 3$). Some specific comments were: "He looks at the book while he is listening"; "Because she points to the word that she is looking at and listening to"; and "He comes out of his room laughing and talking about the book."

Table 8
Means and Percentage for Items in the Parent Survey (SRSBAH Group)

A.* Did your child remember to bring the "Dog Gone Good" books/tapes home and then bring them back to school on his/her own? $M = 3.57$ ($N = 42$)

Never	Seldom	Sometimes	Most of the time	(Not answered)
—	5%	14%	76%	5%

B.* About how many days a week does your child read along with the audiotape? $M = 3.59$ ($N = 39$)

Less than once a week	Once a week	Two or three times a week	Almost every day
—	5%	31%	64%

C. Does your child look at the book while he/she is listening to the audiotape? $M = 3.9$ ($N = 41$)

Never	Not very often	Sometimes	Often
—	—	12%	88%

D.* Do you think your child pays attention to the words in the book while he/she listens? $M = 3.73$ ($N = 41$)

Never	Not very often	Sometimes	Often
—	2%	22%	76%

E. Does your child ever talk about the books that he/she listens to on the tape recorder? $M = 3.24$ ($N = 41$)

Never	Not very often	Sometimes	Often
—	10%	56%	34%

F. Has using the books and tapes helped your child learn to read? $M = 3.44$ ($N = 39$)

Not at all	A little	Some	A lot
—	15%	26%	59%

G.* Does your child enjoy listening to and reading with the tape recorder? $M = 3.68$ ($N = 40$)

Not at all	A little	Some	A lot
—	2.5%	27.5%	70%

H.* Has using the books and tapes increased your child's interest in reading? $M = 3.6$ ($N = 40$)

Not at all	A little	Some	A lot
—	5%	25%	70%

I. Has participating in the "Dog Gone Good" books and tapes project provided you with ideas for helping your child with reading? $M = 3.34$ ($N = 41$)

No	Not Many	Quite a few	Many
—	12%	42%	46%

* Scale reversed on original survey.

Parents indicated that children frequently talked about the books they listened to. Their conversation sometimes involved story retelling (N =3); a reference to the difficulty of the book (N = 4); or a reference to another aspect of the book (e.g., character, setting, title) (N = 3). Some specific comments included: "Lu mentioned the animals in the books that he reads"; "Sometimes he talks about the people or what happened in the book"; "If he likes it, he tells me if it's funny. He tells me all the books he likes"; and "Tells us if the book is hard or easy." A large majority of these parents (N = 13) reported that their child was "reading more" and also that their child was reading books other than the project books (N = 12). Some specific comments were: "She's reading more and better. This thing is helping her a lot. Loan is reading better and is improving"; "He sometimes goes to the library with his sister to check out books to read"; and "She reads more often."

Parents reported almost unanimously (N = 14) that their child enjoyed listening to and reading with the tape recorder and had no problems using the books, tapes, or tape recorder. Two specific comments were: "He likes to read along with the tape," and "He says it helps him learn to read." They also reported positive participation of other family members. For example, several parents mentioned that their child read with other family members (N = 10). Some specific comments from parents of second-language learners were: "The family is very happy that it's not only Lu can benefit from the program, but the whole family can benefit from listening and learning to speak English"; "They loved the idea of reading with the books and tape. It also help other member of the family to learn English"; "It is a good way to learn English and other member of family can benefit as well"; and "He reads with his sister who is in kindergarten, so she is learning to read. They like it." Other than the focus on learning English, most of the NES parents' comments parallel those of ESL parents. Some specific comments of parents of NES students were: "My younger child enjoys listening," "His younger brother is learning with him," and "Two sisters also listen!"

Teacher Questionnaire and Interview

At the conclusion of the study, each participating teacher completed a written questionnaire and was then individually interviewed. The interview items were based on those in the written questionnaire. The interview format provided an opportunity for teachers to confirm and expand on their questionnaire responses.

All the teachers in this study reported that they used shared reading on a regular basis and had incorporated some type of school-home reading program prior to their participation in the study. However, none of these school-home programs involved children taking books or books and tapes home on a daily basis. All the teachers viewed shared reading as an important instructional activity and a school-home reading program as a useful support activity.

At the conclusion of the study, teachers in both the SRSBAH and SRS groups reported that the books provided by the project were an important addition to their classroom. Teachers

most frequently mentioned the benefits of providing choice and its impact on both motivation and student's self-concept as a reader. Some specific comments made by the teachers were: "Having a sufficient variety (of books) with language they are familiar with and having the levels showed them they could read"; "They could read a variety of books at a level and felt successful"; and "[Project books] developed confidence." Teachers in both the SRSBAH and SRS groups were extremely positive about the impact of shared reading with project books on student attitude. Teachers frequently mentioned that the book introduction and sharing was an important factor in motivating students, both generally in terms of wanting to read, and specifically in terms of wanting to read a particular book. In addition, teachers mentioned frequently that shared reading with project books increased student self-confidence and provided additional opportunities to hear fluent models. Some specific comments made by the teachers were: "It [shared reading] developed confidence . . . they get to hear language . . . good for a high minority population because they can hear another adult talk like books . . . it encouraged positive attitude"; and "They now like to read independently or with a friend."

All the teachers in the SRSBAH group were enthusiastic about sending books with audiotapes home and mentioned their students' increased reading interest and achievement. These teachers also planned to use books with audiotapes as part of their next year's school-home reading program. Some specific comments from teachers were: "If I purposely pulled out a book that was a little harder, they could read it the next day"; "Got kids excited. Many wanted to listen to books again"; ". . . encouraged talk about books. Last year I didn't have that kind of talk going on"; "boosted self-concept"; "DEAR time got longer"; and "Children chose to read. They love to read."

Teachers also mentioned many positive parent responses. Some parents had observed that using the audiotaped books had encouraged brothers and sisters to read. Parents of ESL children reported special benefits of using the books and tapes. One parent noted, "My child's oral language vocabulary has grown so much. His English has grown because of the tapes." Other parents of ESL children commented that the tapes helped the whole family learn English.

Discussion

The purpose of this study was to investigate whether rereading at home is a significant supplement to the literacy instructional program of second-language learners and native English-speaking students. Of specific interest was exploring the impact of increased access to books and rereading with an audio model on children's reading achievement and motivation. Participation in a book-rich literacy instructional program that included rereading of multi-level patterned books at home with audiotapes (SRSBAH) was compared with (a) participation in a book-rich program including multi-level patterned books based only in school (SRS), and (b) participation in an unmodified instructional reading program (Control). Comparisons were made on measures of fluent oral reading, comprehension, and reading motivation/be-

havior. In addition, this study investigated whether there was a relationship between students' English language proficiency and their learning of literacy skills through participation in a school-home reading program.

The results of this study add substantial documentation to a growing body of research that attempts to identify specific features of literacy instruction that foster achievement and motivation. The initial focus of the study was to examine the effects of a school-home program to supplement classroom literacy instruction. This program included the use of a large number of additional books that were shared in the classroom before they were used at home (SRSBAH). In order to evaluate the impact of the home component, it was necessary to have a treatment condition that had the same book-rich classroom environment without the home-based reading component (SRS).

It is noteworthy that our findings revealed benefits of book-rich classrooms both with and without a home component. The SRSBAH and SRS groups' scores were significantly higher on comprehension (Oral Retelling) and motivational (Me and My Reading) measures than the scores of the Control group. Observational data from teachers and parents supported the above findings. Teachers of children in the SRSBAH and SRS groups substantiated indications of increased interest in books and reading. The significant differences among groups related to students' references to books are of particular interest. The SRSBAH and SRS teachers noted that students' conversations contained references to books more frequently than did the teachers in the Control group. Parents also noticed their children's interest in reading. The SRSBAH and SRS parents most frequently mentioned "reading" as what their child liked best about school, while Control parents more frequently mentioned "playing with others/recess/play time."

There are a number of reasons that may account for the significantly higher comprehension and motivation scores of the SRSBAH and SRS groups. In this study, the SRSBAH and SRS classrooms conducted a shared reading activity in school with each of the books. Recent research (Reutzel et al., 1994) documents the effectiveness of shared reading as an instructional procedure. In addition, Feitelson et al. (1993) demonstrate the value of teachers reading to students as a way to increase a second-language learner's reading achievement. In the current study, the shared reading provided an auditory model, extended background vocabulary knowledge, and generally excited students' interest by the teacher's attention to the book. Teachers in all three conditions reported using shared reading at least three to four times a week. So it appears that all children in this study were receiving the benefits of this instructional procedure. It should be noted, however, that shared reading in the SRSBAH and SRS classrooms included the shared reading of multi-level project books. Teachers attempted to choose books at students' instructional levels, present books in small groups, and provide structured introductions to project books; whereas shared reading in the Control group usually included whole group sharing of big books or charts chosen according to topic or theme.

Teachers in both SRSBAH and SRS classrooms were extremely positive about the im-

pact of shared reading with project books on student attitude. They noted the importance of the book introduction and book sharing in motivating students. In addition, teachers mentioned frequently that shared reading with project books increased student self-confidence and provided additional opportunities to hear fluent models of English. "It [shared reading] developed confidence . . . they get to hear language . . . good for a high minority population because they can hear another adult talk like a book. It encouraged positive attitude"; and "They now like to read independently or with a friend."

Book access was another important element in accounting for the difference between the book-rich classrooms and the Control group. The SRSBAH and SRS teachers were especially enthusiastic about the additional books provided by the project. Recent research confirms the importance of having access to large numbers of books (Elley, 1991, 1996; Gambrell, 1993; Guice et al., 1996). Following shared reading with the teacher, the project books remained available to the students for rereading. They provided an opportunity for reading practice with easy books, which is helpful to beginning readers in developing fluency (Clay, 1991; De Ford, 1991; Rasinski, 1990; Shany & Biemiller, 1995).

In addition, teachers in both groups were impressed with students' enthusiasm for reading more books and reading with friends and family. In the SRS group, it appears that having the increased number of books at school also encouraged reading at home. This finding is similar to results reported by Elley (1991, 1996) and Gambrell (1993). In commenting on why they felt having the additional materials was advantageous, teachers most frequently mentioned the benefits of providing choice and its impact on both motivation and students' concepts of themselves as readers. They also noted the benefit of having many books of varying levels of difficulty that provided opportunities for repeated practice with books that appealed to the children. Some specific comments made by the teachers were: "having a sufficient variety [of books] with language they are familiar with . . . having the levels, showed them they could read"; "They could read a variety of books at a level and felt successful"; and "[Project books] developed confidence."

The literature related to developing expertise suggests the importance of providing opportunities for children to gain knowledge, feel successful, acquire strategies, and be motivated to practice (Meichenbaum & Biemiller, 1990). The program, materials, and activities in this study represent an attempt to respond to the practical implications of this theory base. Students in the SRSBAH and SRS groups were in learning environments that fostered reading expertise by providing a book-rich environment and many opportunities to reread books. Shared reading with the teacher, other students, parents, or the audiotapes provided scaffolding to ensure that students could read with understanding and feel successful. The rereading with a partner in school or at home with an audiotape was clearly an effective strategy that students intentionally used to improve their own reading. It also appears that motivation to read was positively affected by having a teacher as a reading mod-

el, by increased access to and familiarity with books, by opportunities for choice of books, and social interactions related to books.

In this study, there were special benefits related to the use of books and audiotapes at home. This supplement to classroom literacy instruction was valuable for both second-language learners and native English-speaking students. Students who read books with audiotapes at home appeared to be highly motivated to participate in this activity and were able to articulate how it was helpful. Eighty percent of the SRSBAH students stated that reading books with audiotapes at home helped them learn to read "a lot." Students commented, "The book has a lot of words you don't know and the tape shows you what they are"; and "It helps me learn from reading." These students were also extremely positive about the activity, with 80% mentioning that they enjoyed it "a lot." They noted: "It's fun taking books home from school"; "I like reading them"; and "It was fun reading with the tape." Students were also able to complete the home-based reading with audiotapes activity independently, and they did so on a regular basis.

Teacher observations and interviews revealed important advantages to using books and tapes at home. The SRSBAH group teachers were significantly more positive than teachers in the SRS group about the project's impact on students' reading achievement. When commenting on student achievement, one SRSBAH teacher noted, "If I purposely pulled out a book that was a little harder, they could read it the next day." Another teacher, commenting on the many discussions students had about books, mentioned, "Last year I didn't have that kind of talk going on." Both the teachers and students recognized the benefits of using audiotapes. It seems that these audio models provided a form of scaffolding that is so valuable for beginning readers (Feitelson et al., 1993; Vygotsky, 1978). This support made it possible for children to read more difficult material and also focus on meaning.

The SRSBAH group teachers were also significantly more positive than teachers in the SRS group about the project's impact on students' interest in reading. Along with this general observation of increased student interest were other teacher observations and comments related specifically to changes in student behavior with books. As expected, data from the Individual Child Observation Survey revealed significant differences among groups in the frequency with which children took books home. Teachers reported that SRSBAH children took home books more frequently than did SRS or Control group children. Of specific interest were the significant differences among treatment groups related to students' free-time activities. Teachers in the SRSBAH group reported more frequently than either the SRS or the Control group teachers that their students would choose to read a book in their free time. One SRSBAH teacher said that many students "wanted to listen to books again and again." She noted the books "helped develop independence" and "encouraged positive attitude about reading." These data on enhanced student motivation support and extend previous research that explored increased book access (Gambrell, 1993; Guice et al., 1996) and access to books with audiotapes (Blum et al., 1995).

Teachers also felt that parental involvement in the home-based reading with audiotapes was particularly valuable. Teachers reported comments from parents such as: "siblings could listen"; "child took pride in being able to read to the whole family"; and "[reading] boosted the kid's self-confidence." Teachers felt the books and tapes activity "opened parents' eyes to the importance of books in the home." One teacher reported, "Some [parents] have gone out and bought books."

Parents of the students participating in the SRSBAH activity were positive about their child's home-based reading. Eighty-five percent of the SRSBAH parents reported that their child's reading was helped "some" or "a lot" by participating in the activity. Parent responses reflected awareness of specific reading behaviors, such as the child looking at the book while reading, pointing to the words, and retelling the story. As expected, SRSBAH parents' rating of the frequency of children bringing books home from school was significantly higher than those of SRS and Control group parents. The majority of SRSBAH parents confirmed child and teacher reports that children remembered to bring home and return the books and that children read along with the books and tapes regularly. Although the books and tapes activity was designed so that children could complete the activity independently, it was particularly interesting to find that almost all the children reported that other family members did in fact listen to them read at least once a week. Fifty percent of the SRSBAH children reported that someone listened to them read almost everyday.

The SRSBAH group parents also noted the positive impact of the books and tapes activity on their child's motivation to read. They indicated that children frequently talked about the books they brought home for the books and tapes activity. One parent mentioned, "He comes out of his room laughing and talking about the book." These parents reported expanded interest in reading, reflected by the child reading more and also reading books other than the project books. A parent commented, "She's reading more and better. This thing is helping her a lot." Another parent reported, "He likes to read along with the tape. . . . He says it helps him learn to read." Parents also reported a positive response from other family members: "He reads with his sister who is in kindergarten so she is learning to read. They like it"; "My younger child enjoys listening"; and "His younger brother is learning with him."

Another component of this study was to determine whether there was a relationship between students' English language proficiency and their learning of literacy skills through participation in a school-home reading program. While using books and tapes at home appears to be an appealing and productive reading activity for both ESL and NES students, the findings from this study indicate that this activity may be especially appropriate for second-language learners. It is clear from the data that most of the students in the SRSBAH group enjoyed reading books with tapes at home. When rating how much they liked this activity, however, responses of ESL students were significantly higher than those of NES students. In addition, ESL parent comments

pointed out some special benefits of using books with tapes in an ESL household, "The family is very happy that it's not only Lu can benefit from the program, but the whole family can benefit from listening and learning to speak English." In a sense, the audiotapes put English words "in the air" in ESL homes and, as a result, family members became more aware of their child's reading. This increased social interaction is a vital element in fostering literacy learning (Guthrie, Schafer, Wang, & Afflerbach, 1993).

Certain findings related to the SRSBAH group suggest particular benefits for the ESL children with services who have been designated by the school system as least proficient in speaking and reading English. While 75% of the SRSBAH children reported that they practiced reading with books and tapes every day, it is interesting to note that ESL students with services reported practicing even more frequently than ESL students without services. In the SRSBAH group, there were also significant differences among language proficiency groups related to bringing home and returning books. Teachers observed that ESL students with services remembered to bring home and return books and tapes significantly more often. As discussed in previous research with ESL students receiving services (Blum et al., 1995), home-based rereading with an audio model provided beginning readers an opportunity for success. Their enthusiastic behavior may be an indication that students recognized this activity as a useful strategy to help them learn to read.

Teachers of SRSBAH students reported that ESL students with services produced writing that reflected books they had reread with tapes significantly more often than ESL students without services. For these ESL students with services, there appeared to be what Brown and Cambourne (1987) refer to as linguistic spill-over between the texts students read and their writing. Vocabulary and text features from books students listened to at school and at home appeared in writing they produced in school. The additional rereading and listening experiences appeared to transfer to improved writing.

The promising findings related to benefits of increasing book access with a home-based reading program in the Blum et al. (1995) study, and the results from the current study suggest the need for additional research to specify the essential features of an effective school-home program. While it appears that first-grade students benefit from rereading books with audiotapes at home, providing students with books, audiotapes, and tape recorders requires considerable preparation of materials and is more expensive than simply using books. There is a need, therefore, to determine whether home rereading of books is as effective as home rereading of books with audiotapes in exciting interest and helping ensure success. Additionally, there continues to be a need to investigate how the introduction of storybooks and audiotapes at home influence parents' interest and support of their child's literacy activities.

The importance of the elementary school years in shaping future reading motivation and achievement has been well-established (Allington, 1994; Purcell-Gates, McIntyre, & Freppon, 1995; Turner, 1995). We know that children who are motivated and spend more

time reading are better readers. As Gambrell points out "in order for students to develop into mature, effective readers, they must possess both the *skill* and the *will* to read" (Gambrell, 1996). With the rapidly increasing numbers of second-language learners in elementary school classrooms and the difficulty they are experiencing in learning to read, educators need to respond with programs that focus on enhancing motivation as well as achievement. These programs must be appropriate for both second-language learners and native English-speaking students working together in the same classroom. In addition, educators need to find ways to expand and support literacy instruction beyond the confines of the classroom. The results of the present study demonstrate the benefits of increasing book access and providing opportunities for rereading at school as well as at home. The home-based reading with audiotapes also increased students' interest in reading and promoted parental support and involvement in literacy activities. This study is one example of a school program that supports effective classroom instruction in a way that helps students develop reading expertise. The home-based reading, which students clearly enjoyed, provided a way to extend literacy learning into the home environment and encourage reading as a pleasurable activity. If we want our children to become lifelong readers, educators need to give thoughtful consideration to developing more educational programs that provide meaningful reading opportunities in recreational as well as educational settings.

References

Alexander, K. L., & Entwisle, D. R. (1988). Achievement in the first 2 years of school: Patterns and processes. *Monographs of the Society of Research in Child Development, 53*, 1–157.

Allington, R. L. (1994). The schools we have. The schools we need. *The Reading Teacher, 48*, 14–29.

Allington, R. L., & McGill-Franzen, A. (1993, October 13). What are they to read? Not all children, Mr. Riley, have easy access to books. *Education Week*, 26.

Anzalone, B., Straub, M., & Thomas, W. (1994, February). *An inclusive model for the reading-writing classroom*. Paper presented at the Virginia State Reading Association, Arlington, VA.

Blum, I. H., Koskinen, P. S., Tennant, N., Parker, E. M., Straub, M., & Curry, C. (1995). Using audiotaped books to extend classroom literacy instruction onto the homes of second-language learners. *Journal of Reading Behavior, 27*, 535–563.

Blum, I. H., & Koskinen, P. S. (1991). Repeated reading: A strategy for enhancing fluency and fostering expertise. *Theory into Practice, 30*, 195–200.

Boyle, O. F., & Peregoy, S. F. (1990). Literacy scaffolds: Strategies for first- and second-language readers and writers. *The Reading Teacher, 44*, 194–200.

Brandt, D. (1990). *Literacy as involvement: The acts of writers, readers, and texts*. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.

Brown, H., & Cambourne, B. (1987). *Read and retell*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Carbo, M. (1978). Teaching reading with talking books. *The Reading Teacher, 32*, 267–273.

Chomsky, C. (1976). After decoding: What? *Language Arts, 53*, 288–296.

Clay, M. (1993). *An observation survey of early literacy achievement*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Clay, M. (1991). *Becoming literate: The construction of inner control*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Csikszentmihaly, M. (1991). Literacy and intrinsic motivation. In S. R. Graubard (Ed.), *Literacy: An overview by fourteen experts* (pp. 115-140). New York: Farrar, Straus, and Giroux.

Dahl, P. J. (1974). *An experimental program for teaching high speed word recognition and comprehension skills* (Final Report of Project No. 3-1154). Washington, DC: National Institute of Education, Office of Research. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 099 812)

DeFord, D. (1991). Fluency in initial reading instruction: A reading recovery lesson. *Theory Into Practice, 30*, (3), 201-210.

Dowhower, S. I. (1987). Effects of repeated reading on second-grade transitional readers' fluency and comprehension. *Reading Research Quarterly, 22*, 389-406.

Durkin, D. (1966). *Children who read early*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Elley, W. B. (1996). *Lifting literacy levels with story books: Evidence from the South Pacific, Singapore, Sri Lanka and South Africa*. Paper presented at World Conference on Literacy, Philadelphia, PA.

Elley, W. B. (1992). *How in the world do students read*? Hamburg, Germany: International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement.

Elley, W. B. (1991). Acquiring literacy in a second language: The effect of book-based programs. *Language Learning, 41*, (3), 375-411.

Elley, W. B. (1989). Vocabulary acquisition from listening to stories. *Reading Research Quarterly, 24*, 174-187.

Elley, W. B., & Mangubhai, F. (1983). The impact of reading on second language learning. *Reading Research Quarterly, 19*, 53-67.

Feitelson, D., Goldstein, Z., Iraqi, J., & Share, D. L. (1993). Effects of listening to story reading on aspects of literacy acquisition in a diglossic situation. *Reading Research Quarterly, 28*, 71-79.

Fitzgerald, J. (1995a). English-as-a-second language learners' cognitive reading processes: A review of research in the United States. *Review of Educational Research, 2*, 145-190.

Fitzgerald, J. (1995b). English-as-a-second language reading instruction in the United States: A research review. *Journal of Reading Behavior, 27*, 115-152.

Gambrell, L. B. (1996). Creating classroom cultures that foster reading motivation. *The Reading Teacher, 50*, 14-25.

Gambrell, L. B. (1993). *The impact of RUNNING START on the reading motivation and behavior of first-grade children*. Unpublished manuscript, National Reading Research Center, University of Maryland at College Park.

Gamby, G. (1983). Talking books and taped books. *The Reading Teacher, 36*, 366-369.

Garcia, E. (1992). Linguistically and culturally diverse children: Effective instructional practices and related policy issues. In H. C. Waxman, J. Walker de Felix, J. E., Anderson, & H. P. Baptiste, Jr. (Eds.), *Students at risk in at risk-schools: Improving environments for learning* (pp. 65-86). Newbury Park, CA: Corwin.

Gersten, R., & Jimenez, R. T. (1994). A delicate balance: Enhancing literature instruction for students of English as a second language. *The Reading Teacher, 47*, 438-449.

Guice, S., Allington, R., Johnston, R., Baker, K., & Michelson, N. (1996). Access?: Books, children, and literature-based curriculum in schools. *The New Advocate, 9*, 197-207.

Guthrie, J. T., Schafer, W., Wang, Y., & Afflerbach, P. (1993). *Influences of instruction on reading engagement: An empirical exploration*

of a social-cognitive framework of reading activity (Reading Research Report No. 3). Athens, GA: NRRC, Universities of Georgia and Maryland.

Hansen, K. A., & Bachu, A. (1995). The foreign-born population: 1994. In *Current population reports: Population characteristics* (Census Bureau Report No. P20-486). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Commerce.

Herman, P. A. (1985). The effect of repeated readings on reading rate, speech pauses, and word recognition accuracy. *Reading Research Quarterly, 20*, 553-564.

Huck, C., Hepler, S., & Hickman, J. (1993). *Children's literature in the elementary school*. New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston.

Koskinen, P. S., & Blum, I. H. (1984). Repeated oral reading and the acquisition of fluency. In J. Niles & L. Harris (Eds.), *Changing perspectives on research in reading/language processing and instruction. Thirty-third yearbook of the National Reading Conference* (pp. 183-187). Rochester, NY: National Reading Conference.

Koskinen, P. S., Blum I. H., Tennant, N., Parker, E. M., Straub, M., & Curry, C. (1995). Have You Heard Any Good Books Lately? Encouraging Shared Reading at Home with Books and Audiotapes. In L. M. Morrow (Ed.), *Family Literacy: Connections in Schools and Communities* (pp. 87-103). Newark, DE: IRA.

Lau, K. S., & Cheung, S. M. (1988). Reading interests of Chinese adolescents: Effects of personal and social factors. *International Journal of Psychology, 23*, 695-705.

McCombs, B. L. (1989). Self-regulated learning and academic achievement: A phenomenological view. In B. J. Zimmerman & D. H. Schunk (Eds.), *Self-regulated learning and achievement: Theory, research, and practice* (pp. 51-82). New York: Springer-Verlag.

McGill-Franzen, A. M., & Allington, R. L. (1991). Every child's right: Literacy. *The Reading Teacher, 45*, 5-11.

Meichenbaum, D., & Biemiller, A. (1990, May). *In search of student expertise in the classroom: A metacognitive analysis*. Paper presented at the Conference on Cognitive Research for Instructional Innovation, University of Maryland, College Park, MD.

Morrow, L. M. (1992). The impact of a literature-based program on literacy achievement, use of literature, and attitudes of children from minority backgrounds. *Reading Research Quarterly, 27*, 251-275.

O'Shea, L. J., Sindelar, P. T., & O'Shea, D. J. (1985). The effects of repeated readings and attentional cues on reading fluency and comprehension. *Journal of Reading Behavior, 17*, 120-142.

Oldfather, P. (1993). What students say about motivating experiences in a whole language classroom. *The Reading Teacher, 46*, 672-681.

Purcell-Gates, V., McIntyre, E., & Freppon, P. A. (1995). Learning written storybook language in school: A comparison of low-SES children in skills-based and whole language classrooms. *American Educational Research Journal, 32*, 659-685.

Rasinski, T. V. (1990). Effects of repeated reading and listening-while-reading on reading fluency. *Journal of Educational Research, 83*, 147-150.

Reutzel, D. R., Hollingsworth, P. M., & Eldredge, J. L. (1994). Oral reading instruction: The impact on student reading development. *Reading Research Quarterly, 29*, 41-62.

Ruddell, R. B. (1995). Those influential literacy teachers: Meaning negotiators and motivation builders. *The Reading Teacher, 48*, 454-463.

Samuels, S. J. (1979). The method of repeated reading. *The Reading Teacher, 32*, 403-408.

Shany, M. T., & Biemiller, A. (1995). Assisted reading practice: Effects on performance for poor readers in grades 3 and 4. *Reading Research Quarterly, 30*, 382-395.

Snow, D. E., Barnes, W. S., Chandler, J., Goodman, I. F., & Hemphill, L. (1991). *Unfulfilled expectations: Home and school influences on literacy*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Teale, W. H. (1986). Home background and young children's literacy development. In W. H. Teale & E. Sulzby (Eds.), *Emergent literacy: Writing and reading* (pp. 173-206). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Tobin, A. W., & Pikulski, J. J. (1988). A longitudinal study of the reading achievement of early and nonearly readers through the sixth grade. *National Reading Conference Yearbook, 37*, 49-58.

Topping, K. (1987). Paired reading: A powerful technique for parent use *The Reading Teacher, 40*, 608-614.

Trachtenberg, P., & Ferruggia, A. (1989). Big books from little voices: Reaching high risk beginning readers. *The Reading Teacher, 42*, 284-289.

Trueba, H. T. (1989). *Raising silent voices: Educating the linguistic minorities for the 21st century*. New York: Newbury House.

Turner, J. D., & Paris, S. G. (1995). How literacy tasks influence children's motivation for literacy. *The Reading Teacher, 48*, 662-675.

Turner, J. D. (1995). The influence of classroom contexts on young children's motivation for literacy. *Reading Research Quarterly, 30*, 410-441.

U.S. Department of Education, Office of the Secretary. (1992, June 30). *The condition of bilingual education in the nation: A report to Congress and the President*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Office of the Secretary.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Wells, C. G. (1985). Preschool literacy-related activities and success in school. In D. Olson, N. Torrance, & A. Hildyard (Eds.), *Literacy, language, and learning: The nature and consequence of literacy* (pp. 229-255). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Yaden, D. (1988). Understanding stories through repeated read-alouds. How many does it take? *The Reading Teacher, 41*, 556-560.

Author's Note. Additional support for this project was provided by The Wright Group and Rigby Education publishing companies, and the Circuit City Stores, Inc. We express our sincere appreciation to the following teachers who participated in our study: Tracie Berry, Natalie Bohlmann, Sally Burdick, Tara Burke, Dianna White Gartrell, Karen Kirkman, Grace Ku, Nancy McFadden, Eileen McMahon, Ellen Thomas, Mary Ann Stevener, and Lee White. In addition, valuable assistance was given by Linda Gambrell, Eileen Kramer, Douglas Coulson, Katherine Kane, Cynthia Lake, Qiang Ko, Norma Dunn, Amy Blum, Benjamin McGrew, Cheryl Koskinen, and Jason Goldstein.

Appendix

APPENDIX

Books Used in the School-Home Reading Projects

TITLE	PUBLISHER	LEVEL*	# OF WORDS
Baby Gets Dressed	Wright	E	16
The Farm	Rigby	E	28
The Ghost	Wright	E	26
Go, Go, Go	Wright	E	17
A Party	Wright	E	14
What Are You?	Rigby	E	27
Who Likes Ice Cream?	Rigby	E	15
A Zoo	Rigby	E	28
All Of Me	Rigby	E	25
The Ball Game	Rigby	E	37
Buffy	Rigby	E	31
The Chocolate Cake	Wright	E	23
The Circus	Rigby	E	28
Don't Wake the Baby	Rigby	E	18
Frightened	Wright	E	42
Fruit Salad	Rigby	E	29
In the Mirror	Wright	E	23
Jack-in-the-box	Rigby	E	34
Major Jump	Wright	E	22
My Home—Cowley	Wright	E	46
Our Baby	Rigby	E	28
A Scrumptious Sundae	Rigby	E	32
The Tree House	Wright	E	32
A Toy Box	Rigby	E	33
What's for Lunch?	Wright	E	36
Who's Coming for a Ride	Rigby	E	25
Yuck Soup	Wright	E	25
Big and Little	Wright	E	36
Buzzing Flies	Wright	E	45
Dear Santa	Rigby	E	49
Dressing Up	Rigby	E	31
Getting Ready for the Ball	Rigby	E	27
I Love My Family	Wright	E	31
In My Bed	Rigby	E	57
Little Brother	Wright	E	31

*Level: E = Emergent, N = Novice, A = Apprentice, and D = Developing

Appendix continued

TITLE	PUBLISHER	LEVEL*	# OF WORDS
A Monster Sandwich	Wright	E	36
My Home—Melser	Wright	E	42
Nighttime	Wright	E	44
Sharing	Rigby	E	24
Shoo!	Wright	E	37
Silly Old Possum	Wright	E	41
The Storm	Wright	E	29
Sunrise	Rigby	E	46
Teeny Tiny Tina	Rigby	E	34
Tommy's Tummy Ache	Rigby	E	20
Uncle Buncle's House	Wright	E	56
What Has Spots?	Rigby	E	29
When I Play	Rigby	E	31
Climbing	Rigby	E	34
Happy Birthday!	Rigby	E	28
Houses	Wright	E	59
In My Room	Rigby	E	44
Little Pig	Wright	E	53
The Monsters' Party	Wright	E	92
Our Street	Wright	E	40
The Pet Parade	Rigby	E	33
The Scarecrow	Rigby	E	31
Up in a Tree	Wright	E	47
Wake up, Mom!	Wright	E	94
The Bike Parade	Rigby	N	16
The Farm Concert	Wright	N	74
Hello Goodbye	Rigby	N	29
Horace	Wright	N	56
The Monkey Bridge	Wright	N	63
Our Dog Sam	Rigby	N	56
Reading is Everywhere	Wright	N	53
Surprise Cake	Rigby	N	32
We Make Music	Rigby	N	44
What Can Fly?	Rigby	N	28
Along Comes Jake	Wright	N	86

*Level: E = Emergent, N = Novice, A = Apprentice, and D = Developing

Appendix continued

TITLE	PUBLISHER	LEVEL*	# OF WORDS
Bread	Wright	N	69
Goodbye, Lucy	Wright	N	60
Mr. Grump	Wright	N	77
One Cold, Wet Night	Wright	N	134
The Seed	Wright	N	51
Too Big for Me	Wright	N	70
Where Are You Going, Aja Rose?	Wright	N	100
Ants Love Picnics Too	Rigby	N	27
The Big Toe	Wright	N	123
The Boogly	Rigby	N	61
In a Dark, Dark Wood	Wright	N	81
Don't You Laugh at Me!	Wright	N	167
Grumpy Elephant	Wright	N	94
The Haunted House	Wright	N	78
The Present	Rigby	N	30
The Red Rose	Wright	N	127
Three Little Ducks	Wright	N	102
Timmy	Rigby	N	54
Two Little Dogs	Wright	N	72
The Well-fed Bear	Rigby	N	35
What Did Kim Catch?	Rigby	N	48
Where is Nancy?	Rigby	N	56
Baby's Birthday	Rigby	N	53
The Best Place	Rigby	N	61
The Farmer and the Skunk	Peguis	N	127
Five Little Monkeys Jumping	Clarion	N	100+
Go Back to Sleep	Rigby	N	74
Guess What!	Rigby	N	28
Let's Have a Swim	Wright	N	74
Oh, A-Hunting We Will Go	Atheneum	N	100+
Teddy Bear, Teddy Bear	Peguis	N	100+
Who Will Be My Mother?	Wright	N	156
Dear Zoo	Four Winds	A	115
The Fat Pig	Peguis	A	100+
Grandpa Snored	Rigby	A	52

*Level: E = Emergent, N = Novice, A = Apprentice, and D = Developing

Appendix continued

TiTLE	PUBLISHER	LEVEL*	# OF WORDS
It's Not Fair	Rigby	A	51
Mike's New Bike	Troll	A	183
Pardon? Said the Giraff	HarperCollins	A	100+
When Dad Came Home	Rigby	A	46
When I Was Sick	Rigby	A	53
Come for a Swim!	Wright	A	100+
Dad's Headache	Wright	A	100+
The Gingerbread Boy	Steck-Vaughan	A	100+
Helping	Scholastic	A	100+
The Hungry Giant	Wright	A	100+
The Lion and the Mouse	Steck-Vaughan	A	100+
Meanies	Wright	A	100+
Rosie's Walk	Macmillan	A	100+
Susie Goes Shopping	Troll	A	100+
T-Shirts	Richard Owen	A	100+
The Wedding	Rigby	A	100+
When Lana Was Absent	Rigby	A	100+
The Cooking Pot	Wright	A	100+
Greedy Cat	Richard Owen	A	100+
Hansel and Gretel	Ladybird	A	100+
Happy Birthday	Troll	A	100+
I Saw A Dinosaur	Rigby	A	100+
My Boat	Wright	A	100+
The Carrot Seed	HarperCollins	A	100+
It Didn't Frighten Me	Scholastic	A	100+
Noise	Wright	A	100+
Obadiah	Wright	A	100+
One Monday Morning	Scribners	A	100+
One Sock, Two Socks	Gage	A	100+
Peanut Butter and Jelly	Dutton	A	100+
The Terrible Tiger	Wright	A	100+
Three Little Witches	Troll	A	100+
Elephant in Trouble	Troll	D	100+
Fun at Camp	Troll	D	100+
The Giant's Boy	Wright	D	100+

*Level: E = Emergent, N = Novice, A = Apprentice, and D = Developing

Appendix continued

TITLE	PUBLISHER	LEVEL*	# OF WORDS
The Three Little Pigs	Gage	D	100+
The Tiny Woman's Coat	Wright	D	100+
Goodnight Moon	HarperCollins	D	100+
Help Me	Wright	D	100+
I Know an Old Lady	Wright	D	100+
I Was Walking Down the Road	Scholastic	D	100+
The Kick-a-lot Shoes	Wright	D	100+
Little Red Riding Hood	Ladybird	D	100+
You'll Soon Grow into Them, Titch	Greenwillow	D	100+
Are You My Mother?	Random House	D	100+
Go, Dog, Go!	Random House	D	100+
Green Eggs and Ham	Random House	D	100+
Hop on Pop	Random House	D	100+
I Can Read with My Eyes Shut!	Random House	D	100+

*Level: E = Emergent, N = Novice, A = Apprentice, and D = Developing

NRRC National
Reading Research
Center

318 Aderhold, University of Georgia, Athens, Georgia 30602-7125
3216 J. M. Patterson Building, University of Maryland, College Park, MD 20742